

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

**Eighty-Second Session
May 31, 2023**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 9:28 a.m. on Wednesday, May 31, 2023, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman David Orentlicher, Assembly District No. 20
Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts, Assembly District No. 13
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen, Assembly District No. 8
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Assembly District No. 34
Assemblywoman Danielle Gallant, Assembly District No. 23

Minutes ID: 1299



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Lisa Partee, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Kasey Rogers, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Jeanette K. Belz, representing Shatterproof
Lynnette Aaron, Administrative Services Officer 4, Division of Health Care
Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services
Lea Case, representing Nevada Psychiatric Association
Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Brian Mason, Tribal Chairman, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian
Reservation
William Adler, representing Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian
Reservation
Lynn Manning John, Vice Principal, Owyhee Combined School, Duck Valley Indian
Reservation
Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association
Christina Erling, Vice President, Government Affairs, Barrick North America
Ken Higbee, Director of Special Services, Elko County School District
Morgan Biaselli, representing Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian
Reservation
Sarah Adler, representing Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian
Reservation
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Michael Hillerby, representing White Pine County School District; and State Board of
Pharmacy
Jennifer R. Lanahan, Esq., representing Las Vegas Paiute Tribe; and Reno Sparks
Indian Colony
Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition
Henry Thorns, representing Dog Catchers Youth Foundation
Lelani Thorpe, Private Citizen, Owyhee, Nevada
Alejandro Rodriguez, Director of Government Relations, Nevada System of Higher
Education
Serena Evans, Policy Director, Nevada Coalition to END Domestic and Sexual
Violence
Kent M. Ervin, Ph.D., State President, Nevada Faculty Alliance
Sheila Bray, Community Partnerships Coordinator for Clark County, Extension,
University of Nevada, Reno
Barbara Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada

Charina de Asis, Director, Office for New Americans, Office of the Governor
Amy Stephenson, Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor
Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director, Nevada Governor's Council on
Developmental Disabilities
Eric Jeng, Acting Executive Director, One APIA Nevada
Nic Ciccone, Legislative Relations Program Manager, Office of the City Manager,
City of Reno
Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County
Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager,
Washoe County
Craig Statucki, Interim Deputy Superintendent for Educator Effectiveness and Family
Engagement, Department of Education
Matthew Tuma, Deputy Director, Department of Administration
Richard P. McCann, J.D., Executive Director, Nevada Association of Public Safety
Officers
John Able, Director, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association;
and representing Las Vegas City Marshals
David Ballantyne, Vice President, Police Officer's Association, Clark County School
District
Matthew Caldwell, President, Police Officer's Association, Clark County School
District
Yolanda Tanaka, Private Citizen, Nevada
David Goldwater, representing Nevada Wholesale
Teresa Hayes, Environmental Health Program Manager, Division of Public and
Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services
Erven T. Nelson, representing American Kratom Association
Jhone Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education
Paige Barnes, representing American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
Cassandra Charles, Campaigns Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Maria-Teresa Liebermann-Parraga, Deputy Director, Battle Born Progress
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom
Kathleen Palmer, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jim DeGraffenreid, National Committeeman, Nevada Republican Party
Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada
Michael Ryan, Private Citizen, Nevada
Theresa DeGraffenreid, Private Citizen, Douglas County, Nevada
Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Research and Project Management Division,
Department of Motor Vehicles
Shelby Port, Battle Born Progress
Amanda Vaskov, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Erik Jimenez, Chief Policy Deputy, Office of the State Treasurer
Mary Walker, representing Douglas County; Lyon County; and Storey County

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

[Roll was called, and the Committee rules and protocols were explained.] There are many moving parts to close this legislative session, and we have many things on the agenda for today. We are going to start with a work session to get bills to the floor, but we are going to get through it all today. The first thing on our agenda for today is going to be a bill draft request introduction.

BDR 31-1199—Revises provisions relating to state financial administration. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 527](#).)

I remind you that this Bill Draft Request (BDR) 31-1199 for Committee introduction is to get the process moving, and a vote is not saying that you agree with the policy. The BDR revises provisions relating to state financial administration. Are there any questions on the BDR? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST 31-1199.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

Our first work session for the day will be on [Assembly Bill 37](#).

[Assembly Bill 37](#): Authorizes the establishment of the Behavioral Health Workforce Development Center of Nevada. (BDR 34-361)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

[Assembly Bill 37](#) was heard by the Committee on May 18, 2023. The bill authorizes the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada to establish the Behavioral Health Workforce Development Center of Nevada at an institution or multiple institutions within the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) in order to increase the number of graduates from high schools in the state who pursue higher education in the field of behavioral health and decrease the time between graduation from a program for the education of providers of behavioral health. The bill indicates that the Center must have a main hub at one of the institutions and a regional hub in each of the behavioral health regions. I would note that NSHE submitted a fiscal note that was revised on May 17, 2023, to reflect a total cost of \$684,926 in fiscal year (FY) 2024, and \$1,369,321 in FY 2025. A State General Fund appropriation would need to be added to this bill if the Committee chose to move this. The motion would be amend and do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or comments on Assembly Bill 37? [There were none.]
I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 37.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign all the floor statements to myself today. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 58.

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

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 58 was heard by the Committee on May 29, 2023. Existing law creates the Nevada Air Service Development Commission, the Nevada Air Service Development Fund, and requires the Commission to develop a program to grant funds to air carriers that will service or provide enhanced services to certain airports in the state. Assembly Bill 58 would provide that the money remains in the Fund and does not revert to the State General Fund at the end of the fiscal year. The bill would also appropriate General Funds of \$5 million in each year of the 2023-2025 biennium for a total of \$10 million in General Fund appropriations.

There has been discussion to also incorporate a portion of Assembly Bill 429 into A.B. 58. The discussion relates to adding an additional \$1 million in General Funds in each year of the 2023-2025 biennium to be used by rural airports to match Federal Aviation Administration funds. If the Committee wishes to incorporate that into A.B. 58, the motion would be amend and do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or comments on Assembly Bill 58? [There were none.]
I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 58.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 84.

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

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 84 revises requirements for the issuance of certain annual permits for entering, camping, and boating in state parks and recreational areas. The bill was presented by Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15 on May 29, 2023. Assembly Bill 84 requires the Division of State Parks, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to issue, free of charge, including waiver of an administrative fee, an annual permit to enter, camp, and boat in all state parks and recreational areas to members of an Indian tribe located in whole or in part of the state.

A proposed amendment was presented by Assemblyman Watts that was discussed during the bill hearing and posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System with the intent to streamline the implementation of the free park pass by using the existing day-use annual pass, establish fee waivers suggested by the Division of State Parks, and expand the bill to include honorably discharged veterans for Nevada residents. Fiscal staff received updated information from the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources regarding the fiscal impact, which is associated with a projected loss of revenue based on the conceptual amendment. That amount totals \$214,545 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$241,909 in FY 2025.

If the Committee wishes to move forward with the bill and the conceptual amendment, the Committee could also include within the amendment to the bill, a State General Fund appropriation to offset that revenue loss. The General Fund appropriation would be equal to the revenue loss of \$214,545 in FY 2024 and \$241,909 in FY 2025. The motion would be amend and do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or discussions on A.B. 84? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 84.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will move to the next item on our work session agenda.

**Assembly Bill 125 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public safety.
(BDR 43-796)**

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 125 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 18, 2023. This bill, as amended, requires the tribal liaison for the Department of Public Safety to maintain ongoing communications related to missing or murdered indigenous people between the Department and Indian tribes and tribal communities of the state; tribal organizations; urban Indian organizations; other tribal liaisons designated by state agencies; and nongovernmental entities that provide services to women who are members of Indian tribes.

Assembly Bill 125 (1st Reprint), as amended, also requires the Peace Officers' Standards and Training Commission (POST) to adopt regulations which require all peace officers to receive training in the taking of reports and handling of cases related to missing indigenous women and other indigenous persons.

A fiscal note was provided by the Investigation Division, Department of Public Safety, of \$104,945 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$113,145 in FY 2025, and it relates to providing a tribal liaison. This was contingent upon Senate Bill 94 not including that position in that bill. Currently, Senate Bill 94 has not been approved by the Senate Committee on Finance. The Committee may wish to consider putting the funding for that position in this bill. If Senate Bill 94 does get approved, then the Committee may also wish to consider, at the point that it comes over to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means, to take out that money if the Senate does incorporate that into Senate Bill 94. If the Committee wishes to add that funding, the motion would be amend and do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or comments on A.B. 125 (R1)?

Assemblyman Hafen:

I want to thank Assemblywoman Backus for this bill. Coming into this session, this was a high priority of mine, and she took the time and energy to do this. This is an important piece of legislation.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions or comments on A.B. 125 (R1)? [There were none.]
I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 125 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will move to Assembly Bill 153 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 153 (1st Reprint): Provides for the regulation of the practice of
naprapathy. (BDR 54-724)**

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 153 (1st Reprint) provides for the regulation and practice of naprapathy. Assembly Bill 153 (1st Reprint), as amended, establishes the Naprapathic Practice Advisory Board, and requires the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services to regulate the practice of naprapathy. The bill requires the State Board of Health to adopt regulations governing the licensure of naprapaths and the practice of naprapathy. A fiscal note was originally submitted by the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine, however, that was removed.

The bill was heard on May 19, 2023, and presented by Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola, Assembly District No. 21. The Division of Public and Behavioral Health submitted an unsolicited fiscal note on the bill as amended that identified costs of approximately \$227,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2024, and approximately \$241,000 in FY 2025. During the bill hearing, the Division of Public and Behavioral Health clarified that they would be collecting a \$25,000 fee per year. The intent would be that the agency would have sufficient revenue collected before contracting for services and believed that the fees would be sufficient to cover the costs. Therefore, there would be no need to appropriate or authorize funds to address the fiscal impact for the Division of Public and Behavioral Health. If the Committee wishes to move the bill, the motion would be do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 153 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will open the work session for
Assembly Bill 155 (1st Reprint).

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

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 155 (1st Reprint) requires certain public and private health insurance plans to cover medically necessary biomarker testing for the diagnosis, treatment, management, and monitoring of a disease or condition for which such testing is supported by medical and scientific evidence. The bill authorizes the Commissioner of Insurance, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry to take certain actions against health insurers who fail to comply with the required establishments.

There was only one fiscal note that remained because of the bill being amended, and that pertained to the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services. They submitted additional estimates of approximately \$2.9 million total for fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$3.4 million total for FY 2025, with the State General Fund component of about \$1 million in FY 2024 and \$1.3 million in FY 2025.

I just received a mockup amendment that would significantly reduce the fiscal impact related to this bill. The amendment would limit the bill to only pertain to cancer. If the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services were required to do an independent study, there would be a cost of \$750,000, of which 50 percent would be provided by federal funds and General Funds would provide the other 50 percent or \$375,000.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or comments on A.B. 155 (R1)? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 155 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 156 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 156 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to substance use disorders.
(BDR 40-331)**

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 156 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to substance use disorders. Assembly Bill 156 (1st Reprint) establishes the order in which a provider or program is required to prioritize persons for participation in certain publicly funded programs for the treatment of alcohol or other substance use disorders; authorizing a pharmacist to prescribe and dispense drugs for medication-assisted treatment of opioid use disorder and perform certain assessments under certain conditions; requiring certain health plans to include coverage for such drugs and assessments; and prescribing certain requirements concerning the diagnosis and treatment of a patient with an opioid use disorder.

There was some fiscal discussion during the bill hearing on May 25, 2023, relating to the requirements of the bill for the Department of Corrections in collaboration with the Department of Health and Human Services. Each county, city, and town that maintains a jail or detention facility must study, during the 2023-2024 interim, certain issues relating to the provision of medication-assisted treatment to incarcerated persons. There was confirmation during the bill hearing that there was no fiscal impact to the Department of Health and Human Services, and a follow-up was requested with the Department of Corrections regarding any fiscal impact of that study. The Committee received confirmation from the Department of Corrections that there is no fiscal impact as a result of the bill as amended. Therefore, the Committee could move this bill with the motion to do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or comments on A.B. 156 (R1)? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 156 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 195 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 195 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing certain fees for drivers' licenses and identification cards. (BDR 43-636)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 195 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 19, 2023. Assembly Bill 195 (1st Reprint) requires the Department of Motor Vehicles to waive fees for the administration of driving exams, furnishing a driver's license, reinstating a driver's license, and producing a photograph for a driver's license for certain persons released from prison. The bill also waives the \$10 penalty for renewal of licenses that have expired for a period of more than 30 days for certain persons released from prison.

The Department of Motor Vehicles projected a revenue loss of approximately \$12,841 in each fiscal year related to lost fee and penalty revenues but indicated that revenue loss can be absorbed by the Department of Motor Vehicles. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the motion would be do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or comments on A.B. 195 (R1)? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 195 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will move to the next item on our agenda.

**Assembly Bill 224 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing collective bargaining.
(BDR 23-155)**

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 224 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing collective bargaining. This bill was heard on May 23, 2023, and was presented by Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24. Assembly Bill 224 (1st Reprint) authorizes collective bargaining between state professional employers and professional employees, which includes certain employees of a board, commission, or similar body within the Executive Branch of state government, including without limitation, the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada; expands the powers and duties of the Government Employee-Management Relations Board, Department of Business and Industry to hear and decide on disputes between state professional employers and professional employees; requires professional employers to file certain reports with the Government Employee-Management Relations Board annually; requires the Government Employee-Management Relations Board to assess a fee on each state professional employer based on the number of professional employees in the bargaining unit with an exclusive representative; and authorizes the state professional employer to use the services of the Division of Human Resource Management, Department of Administration and the Office of the Attorney General to provide support to the state professional employer to carry out the provisions of the bill.

The Government Employee-Management Relations Board submitted a fiscal note identifying an increase in revenues because of the fees that were mentioned. The Division of Human Resource Management, Department of Administration submitted a fiscal note on the bill, as introduced, identifying a fiscal impact of approximately \$161,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and approximately \$201,000 in FY 2025. This was identified for the costs of new positions and operating costs. However, during the bill hearing, the Division of Human Resource Management believed that it would not necessarily be called upon to assist with negotiations or efforts and, therefore, their fiscal note could be removed.

The Nevada System of Higher Education submitted an unsolicited fiscal note on the bill as amended indicating a fiscal impact of \$600,671 in FY 2024 and \$1,290,630 in FY 2025, and approximately \$2.7 million identified in future biennia for new positions to implement the provisions of the bill. The Nevada System of Higher Education specified in the fiscal note that there would be seven new positions in the 2023-2025 biennium. The plan was to fill the remaining five positions in the 2025-2027 biennium.

The Office of the Attorney General submitted an unsolicited fiscal note indicating a fiscal impact of \$181,380 in FY 2024 and \$230,755 in FY 2025. These were identified costs for two positions to support the new collective bargaining units established by the bill.

There was a proposed amendment that was discussed and presented during the bill hearing that was explained by Kent M. Ervin, Ph.D., State President, Nevada Faculty Alliance. There was discussion during the bill hearing regarding uncertainty as to whether the resources identified by both the Nevada System of Higher Education and the Office of the Attorney General would be needed over the upcoming biennium because of A.B. 224 (R1).

If the Committee wishes to move the bill, given that uncertainty, the Committee could amend the bill to incorporate the conceptual amendment that was presented by Dr. Ervin, appropriate funds to address the fiscal impacts identified by the Nevada System of Higher Education and the Office of the Attorney General, but appropriate the funds to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC), and ask that the Nevada System of Higher Education and/or the Office of the Attorney General work through the process to submit a request to access those funds from the IFC once they have demonstrated a need for the necessary resources to carry out the provisions of the bill.

For the record, the figures relating to the Nevada System of Higher Education in FY 2024 are \$600,671, and in FY 2025 are \$1,290,630 and for the Office of the Attorney General are \$181,380 in FY 2024 and \$230,755 in FY 2025. Therefore, the motion or amendment to the bill could incorporate the conceptual amendment presented by Dr. Ervin and appropriate State General Funds in the amounts that I mentioned to the IFC as restricted funds in the Contingency Account and make those available to the Nevada System of Higher Education and the Office of the Attorney General upon approval by the IFC.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or comments on A.B. 224 (R1) about adding Dr. Ervin's amendment but placing those needed funds into the IFC Contingency Account so when that plan is made, there will be a work program to request those funds? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 224 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Hafen:

I appreciate the amendment for this to go to IFC as restricted funds. I am going to vote this out of Committee and look at the policy a bit deeper. I was not a fan of the policy, but I appreciate the amendment. I am going to vote this out of Committee but reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there any other discussion? [There was none.]. We have a motion on the floor.

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 226 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 226 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing tuition for certain students. (BDR 34-668)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 226 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 23, 2023. Assembly Bill 226 (1st Reprint) prohibits the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada from assessing tuition charges against students who successfully completed the high school equivalency assessment selected by the State Board of Education if the assessment was administered by the state. The bill, as amended, further prohibits the Board of Regents from denying an exemption from tuition charges to a student who has been granted temporary protected status and received a grant or deferred action from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

Assembly Bill 226 (1st Reprint) prohibits the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada from denying an exemption from tuition charges if certain provisions of the federal law are repealed or otherwise cease to have effect and if the Attorney General of the United States issues a finding that such a student would be considered lawfully present in the United States.

The Nevada System of Higher Education submitted a fiscal note indicating that A.B. 226 (R1) would reduce tuition revenue. However, the number of students who would no longer be required to pay that tuition could not be determined. As such, while there would be a decrease in the revenue, it is an undetermined amount. If the Committee wishes to pass this piece of legislation, the motion would be do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or comments on A.B. 226 (R1)? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 226 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 232 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 232 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the taxation of other tobacco products. (BDR 32-618)

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 232 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing the taxation of other tobacco products. Assembly Bill 232 (1st Reprint) specifies that of the 30 percent tax on the wholesale price of tobacco products other than cigarettes, the tax imposed on other tobacco products that are premium cigars—cigars that are rolled by hand with wrappers made of whole tobacco leaves which do not have a filter or mouthpiece—have a minimum tax of 30 cents and a maximum tax of 50 cents per premium cigar.

This bill was presented by Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts, Assembly District No. 13, on May 23, 2023. The Department of Taxation indicated that they could not estimate the fiscal impacts of the other tobacco product tax resulting from this legislation as they do not currently collect information on specific tobacco products. They did identify costs associated with programming and overtime totaling \$1,731 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 to implement this piece of legislation. There was testimony by the Department of Taxation that the work could not be absorbed and was not accounted for in the budget that was approved by the money committees. However, given the dollar amount, the Committee could consider moving the bill as amended and ask the Department whether savings could be found within their budget, or could they absorb the costs, or request a work program to move authority from a category with savings to address the additional costs that are identified in their fiscal note of \$1,731. The Department does have access to the Interim Finance Committee Contingency Account during the interim if necessary. The motion could be do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or comments?

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

I appreciate the opportunity to make a comment. Given that this is the money committee, I will vote yes on this bill to move it because of the fiscal note. As a policy, I do not like anything that has to do with promoting smoking. It is a health detriment, and I want that on the record.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

I want to echo my concerns along with my colleague about smoking. This goes against a lot of public health policy. I will be a no vote.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions or comments on A.B. 232 (R1)? [There were none.]
I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 232 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN GORELOW VOTED NO.
ASSEMBLYMEN MILLER AND YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE
VOTE.)

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will
be Assembly Bill 253 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 253 (1st Reprint): Provides for the licensure and regulation of certain
events at which the sale and consumption of cannabis or cannabis products is
allowed. (BDR 56-152)**

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 253 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 27, 2023.
As amended, it provides for the licensure and regulation of temporary cannabis events in
which the sale and consumption of cannabis or cannabis products is allowed. In addition, it
prohibits persons without a temporary cannabis event permit from selling cannabis or
cannabis products at temporary cannabis events and imposes requirements and restrictions on
portable cannabis vendors relating to the operation of temporary cannabis events. The bill
further requires a portable cannabis vendor who holds a temporary cannabis event permit to
purchase all cannabis and cannabis products from adult-use cannabis retail stores.

On May 27, 2023, the bill had a fiscal note from the Department of Taxation of \$187,753 in
fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$203,826 in FY 2025. However, Amendment No. 3716 proposed
by Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller, Assembly District No. 7 would reduce the fiscal
impact. Fiscal staff reached out to the Department of Taxation, and they indicated that they
could revise their fiscal note to \$106,333 in FY 2024 and \$118,021 in FY 2025. That would
reduce the number of positions that they were requesting to provide for this new program
from two to one.

The Cannabis Compliance Board also submitted a fiscal note on the bill as originally
amended and heard by the Committee. The fiscal impact was originally \$1.1 million in
FY 2024 and \$1.5 million in FY 2025. However, the Cannabis Compliance Board has
indicated that it could reduce its request by one position from 13 new positions to 12 new
positions to provide coverage related to these events.

If the Committee wishes to approve this bill, the Committee would need to include State General Fund appropriations for the Department of Taxation of \$106,333 in FY 2024 and \$118,021 in FY 2025. No General Fund appropriations would be required for the Cannabis Compliance Board as they receive fees from the marijuana excise tax, so that funding would be offset and lower the transfer to the State Education Fund for the Cannabis Compliance Board to absorb the cost provided for in their fiscal note. If the Committee wishes to pass this bill, the motion would be amend and do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or comments on A.B. 253 (R1)? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 253 (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. ASSEMBLYMEN MILLER AND YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 270 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 270 (1st Reprint): Provides for the licensure and regulation of anesthesiologist assistants. (BDR 54-714)

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 270 (1st Reprint) provides for the licensure and regulation of anesthesiologist assistants. Assembly Bill 270 (1st Reprint) provides for the licensure and regulation of anesthesiologist assistants by the Board of Medical Examiners and the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine. The bill includes procedures for regulating the practice of anesthesiologists and imposing discipline for violations of the governing statutes and regulations. Amended sections 7 and 46 of the bill add specific provisions to allow anesthesiologist assistants to possess and administer medications, enter verbal or written chart orders in the patient's record as prescribed by the supervising anesthesiologist, and reorganize and revise provisions governing the duties and responsibilities of an anesthesiologist assistant with respect to medication.

The State Board of Osteopathic Medicine had initially identified a fiscal impact of \$7,250 in fiscal year (FY) 2023 and \$52,250 in FY 2024. However, the State Board of Osteopathic Medicine revised its fiscal note and indicated there would be a \$0 impact. Therefore, there would be no need to appropriate or authorize funds for this bill. The motion could be do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions or comments on A.B. 270 (R1)? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 270 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 283 (1st Reprint).

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

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 283 (1st Reprint) was heard on May 30, 2023. As amended, the bill authorizes the Department of Health and Human Services to establish an incentive payment for enrolled doulas who provide doula services to recipients of Medicaid in rural areas of the state and makes changes related to services provided under a federal waiver outside of Medicaid. Assembly Bill 283 (1st Reprint) requires the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services to request an amendment to the Medicaid State Plan to increase the fee for services for the reimbursement rates of doula services to an amount that is intended to cover the cost of the services.

The Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services submitted an unsolicited fiscal note on the revised version of the bill and updated the impact as introduced. The unsolicited fiscal note details a rate of \$1,200 per delivery event. As such, they anticipate additional costs totaling \$466,617 in fiscal year (FY) 2024, which includes \$165,891 in State General Fund appropriations, and a total of \$583,924 in FY 2025, which includes \$205,515 in General Fund appropriations.

If the Committee wishes to approve this bill, it will need to provide the identified General Fund appropriations to address the fiscal impact related to the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy. The motion for the Committee's consideration would be amend and do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions or comments on A.B. 283 (R1)? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 283 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 321 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 321 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to public safety. (BDR 52-753)

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 321 (1st Reprint) makes various changes relating to public safety. Assembly Bill 321 (1st Reprint) establishes specific requirements and restrictions for foil balloons being sold, offered for sale, or manufactured within the state; prohibits the sale or manufacture of foil balloons that do not meet these requirements with some exceptions and certain acts involving theft or damage to the infrastructure of a public utility; mandates that the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN) adopt a standard for testing and evaluating the dielectric performance of foil balloons; and introduces enhanced penalties for assault and battery against a utility worker under certain circumstances.

The PUCN submitted a fiscal note on the bill and identified a fiscal impact of \$7,493 in fiscal year (FY) 2024. However, it indicated that it would not require an increase in the annual regulatory assessment in either fiscal year of the biennium. Given that the PUCN is not funded with State General Fund appropriations, the Committee would not need to appropriate or authorize funds to address the impact as identified by the PUCN.

There was a proposed Amendment No. 3732 submitted that defines a commencement date for certain provisions of the bill and ties the commencement date to a standard that would be set by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. There would be no need

to appropriate or authorize funds for any fiscal impact with the bill if the Committee wishes to approve Amendment No. 3732 to A.B. 321 (R1). The motion would be to amend and do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 321 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Hafen:

I want to provide full disclosure. I am regulated by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada because of the utility company that my family owns. We have no fiscal impact with this bill. I do feel that I can vote on this as I am in a similar situation to all other regulated utilities. If I could make a side note, this is good policy and even if it did increase my taxes, I would still support this.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other comments? [There were none.]

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda is Assembly Bill 383 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 383 (1st Reprint): **Revises provisions relating to health care.**
(BDR 40-116)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 383 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 25, 2023, and as amended, establishes the Right to Reproductive Health Care Act. The bill generally prohibits a governmental entity from enacting or implementing any limitations or requirements that single out reproductive health services and substantially burden access to a person to reproductive health services, drugs or devices related to reproductive health services or information related to reproductive health services, or the ability of a provider of health care to provide reproductive health services, drugs, or devices related to reproductive health services or information related to reproductive health services within his or her scope of practice, training, and experience.

The bill additionally requires the State Plan for Medicaid to cover voluntary sterilization of men, clinical services related to the coverage of contraceptive drugs, devices, and services, and a portion of the cost of language translation services provided to facilitate the provision of covered contraceptive drugs, devices, and services. This bill also requires the State Plan for Medicaid to cover certain contraceptive services when provided by any provider of health care for whom the services are within his or her scope of practice, training, and experience; reimburse a provider of health care other than a physician, physician's assistant, or advanced practice registered nurse for providing such services at a rate that is not less than the rate provided to a physician, physician assistant, or advanced practice registered nurse; and cover such services regardless of whether the services are provided in an inpatient or outpatient setting.

A fiscal note on this legislation was submitted by the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services that indicated a cost of \$191,912 for fiscal year (FY) 2024, and \$352,663 for FY 2025. However, there was a conceptual amendment submitted that does two things. First, it removes section 8, subsections 7(a) and 7(b) and replaces it with the following language: "The Director shall include in the State Plan for Medicaid a requirement that the State pay the nonfederal share of expenditures incurred for the costs of any language translation services provided to facilitate the provision of any drug, device or service described in subsection 1."

A representative from the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy testified at the hearing that with the conceptual amendment, it would reduce the fiscal impact to a total need of \$158,377, which would be roughly \$38,551 in State General Fund appropriations. If the amendment were approved for this piece of legislation, the motion would be amend and do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 383 (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 present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 386 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 386 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to midwives. (BDR 54-111)

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 386 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to midwives. This bill was presented on May 23, 2023, by Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1. Assembly Bill 386 (1st Reprint) creates the Board of Licensed Certified Professional Midwives, which is comprised of nine members appointed by the Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

The measure provides for the licensure of licensed certified professional midwives by the Division of Public and Behavioral Health and specifies the Division and the Board of Licensed Certified Professional Midwives will share responsibility of regulating licensed certified professional midwives. The measure sets forth certain requirements, restrictions, and authorizations for licensed certified professional midwives and requires the Board of Licensed Certified Professional Midwives to adopt regulations governing certified professional midwifery, which includes training programs, licensure qualifications, investigation of misconduct, and discipline management of a client who is at a moderate or high risk of adverse outcome, and certain other aspects of the practice of midwifery. Finally, the bill creates the Collaboration and Transfer Guidelines Workgroup to make recommendations to the Board of Licensed Certified Professional Midwives for regulations governing the transfer to a medical facility of clients who were at a moderate or high risk of adverse outcome.

A fiscal note was submitted by the Division of Public and Behavioral Health that identified costs of approximately \$268,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and approximately \$313,600 in FY 2025 to support two positions relating to the licensure and regulation of certified professional midwives. The Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services had originally identified system costs of approximately \$99,600 in FY 2024 to establish a new provider type. The Division of Health Care Financing and Policy provided updated information and indicated there may be potential savings if individuals choose to deliver outside of a hospital. With those savings, the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy indicated that the state share of their fiscal note could be removed. The Division of Public and Behavioral Health had submitted a revised fiscal note as well.

A mock-up proposed Amendment No. 3747 to A.B. 386 (R1) was submitted. In general, the amendment adds new language in section 15 that provides that sections 2 to 32 do not abridge, limit, or otherwise affect the right of a person to deliver a baby in the manner and location that the person desires. Section 19 would add new language to include a requirement that an applicant to renew a license must have completed continuing education in cultural humility or the elimination of racism or bias. Section 76.5 provides that continuing education in cultural humility, or the elimination of racism or bias completed by a licensed certified professional midwife satisfies the requirement that an agent or employee of certain health care facilities receive training in cultural competency. The amendment would delete section 107 of the bill. Section 19.5 would add additional language to authorize the

Board of Licensed Certified Professional Midwives to establish an advisory committee to advise the Board concerning the adoption of regulations. Section 31 includes new language to prohibit a person who is licensed to perform midwifery in another jurisdiction of the United States who has been suspended or revoked from performing midwifery or holding himself or herself out as a midwife in this state until the license in the other district, state, or territory is restored.

New language in section 31 authorizes the Division of Public and Behavioral Health to order a person to cease and desist from performing midwifery or holding himself or herself out as a midwife if his or her license as a licensed certified professional midwife has been suspended or revoked, and he or she is the subject of pending disciplinary action, or he or she has voluntarily relinquished his or her license under certain circumstances.

With the proposed amendment, we have received information from the Division of Public and Behavioral Health that clarified their fiscal impact would be just over \$26,000 in FY 2024 and just over \$22,000 in FY 2025. The license revenue received because of the provisions of the bill and reserves within the budget would allow the agency to absorb the costs. Therefore, there would be no appropriation or authorization needed if the Committee were to approve the proposed Amendment No. 3747 to A.B. 386 (R1). The Committee could choose to move the bill, and the motion would be to amend and do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 386 (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 present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 388.

Assembly Bill 388: Makes an appropriation to the Department of Sentencing Policy for the purpose of funding certain grants awarded by the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council. (BDR S-1049)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 388 was heard by the Committee on April 20, 2023. The bill makes a State General Fund appropriation to the Department of Sentencing Policy for the purposes of funding certain grants related to reducing recidivism awarded by the Nevada Local Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council to local governments and nonprofit organizations. Upon receipt of the award, the local government or nonprofit organization would be required to submit a report to the Interim Finance Committee on or before December 20, 2024, and on or before September 19, 2025, describing expenditures made from the grant. The entities would also be required to make available to the Legislative Auditor any books, accounts, claims, reports, or other records or information deemed necessary to conduct an audit of the use of these grants. The bill includes a General Fund appropriation of \$3 million. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the motion would be do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 388.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HAFEN VOTED NO.
ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 430 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 430 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to cannabis. (BDR 32-893)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 430 (1st Reprint) was heard by the Committee on May 19, 2023, and as amended, excludes cannabis vaporizers from the definition of other tobacco products which are taxed at a rate of 30 percent. In addition, A.B. 430 (R1) would modify taxes imposed on cannabis. Existing law imposes an excise tax at a rate of 15 percent of the fair market value at wholesale upon each wholesale sale of cannabis by a medical cannabis cultivation facility or an adult-use cannabis cultivation facility to another cannabis establishment. Existing law imposes an excise tax at the rate of 10 percent of the sales price of each retail sale of cannabis or cannabis products by an adult-use cannabis retail store or cannabis consumption

lounge. Section 7 of A.B. 430 (R1) revises the excise tax on the wholesale sale of cannabis to apply the tax only to the first wholesale sale and to provide that the tax is at the rate of 15 percent of either the fair market value at wholesale for sales made to an affiliate of the medical cannabis cultivation facility or adult-use cannabis cultivation facility; or the sales price, if the sale is made to a cannabis establishment that is not an affiliate of the medical cannabis cultivation facility or adult-use cannabis cultivation facility.

We would note that regarding the fiscal impact, while the change is recommended to other tobacco products tax, the cannabis wholesale tax will have an impact on revenues collected on both the unrestricted State General Fund as well as the State Education Fund. However, it is unclear what that fiscal impact may be. Regarding the 15 percent wholesale excise tax, there would be a component of that amount that could be reduced. However, it is unclear at this time what that impact would be on that revenue. If the Committee wishes to pass A.B. 430 (R1) there would not need to be an additional amendment for this, so the motion would be do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 430 (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 present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 441 (1st Reprint).

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

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 441 (1st Reprint) revises provisions relating to industrial insurance. This bill was presented by Jason D. Mills, President-Elect, Nevada Justice Association on May 30, 2023. Assembly Bill 441 (1st Reprint) revises and updates the industrial insurance system. The bill revises provisions related to inspecting insurance records; removes the obligation for entities to maintain collect call services for injured employees; changes physician removal criteria; requires publication of reports; grants physicians the right to decline evaluations; updates provisions for medical examinations and benefits; establishes claim administration requirements; revises reimbursement procedures; and repeals restrictions on self-insured employer associations.

A fiscal note was submitted by the Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry that identified costs of \$491,555 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$427,116 in FY 2025 for five permanent positions and system enhancements related to the increased workload because of the provisions of the bill. The Risk Management Division, Department of Administration indicated in an unsolicited fiscal note that the impact would be approximately \$592,156 in FY 2024 and \$592,156 in FY 2025. The agency indicated the bill would shift the responsibility for the cost of a second permanent partial disability evaluation to the insurer and expand coverage for all accepted claims to request a second permanent partial disability evaluation. According to the agency's fiscal note, there could be a 25 percent increase in the evaluation costs and a 10 percent increase in payouts related to additional permanent disability impairments.

The Risk Management Division indicated during the bill hearing that when they currently see increases in costs, they submit work programs through the work program process to address those costs and would do so if they experienced an increase in costs because of this legislation. They would submit work programs in the upcoming interim and utilize reserve funds, if necessary. The Department also testified that they could look at addressing their rates during the interim and, as necessary, increase those rates. The Department of Business and Industry confirmed with Fiscal staff that their fiscal note still applied to the amended bill.

An amendment was presented during the bill hearing and is posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. The amendment did not impact their fiscal note as submitted, based on information received from the Department of Business and Industry. Neither the Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry, or the Risk Management Division, Department of Administration are funded with State General Fund appropriations.

Given that the actual workload impact is unknown at this point, the Committee could move the bill without appropriating any General Funds or providing any authorizations, which would require the agencies to submit work programs during the interim to address any increased costs as necessary based on the actual workload increases if they are experienced. If the Committee wishes, they could amend the bill to adopt the amendment that was presented during the bill hearing, and the motion would be to amend and do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions or comments?

Assemblywoman Backus:

I want to make a comment. Although these requested increases by the agencies could be subject to a work program, I want to note for the record that if this does come before us, one of the fiscal notes asked for system enhancements to the Claims and Regulatory Data System (CARDS). I want to remind our Committee that when we approved the budget for the Division of Industrial Relations, one of the enhancements we approved was an allocation from the Workers' Compensation and Safety Fund totaling \$2.1 million over the next biennium to fund the modernization of CARDS that is being referenced. I heard from the

presenters who presented this bill that after the initial laws went into place, the number of claims did not increase. Those would be things that I would be looking at if a work program does come before the Interim Finance Committee.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 441 (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 present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 443.

Assembly Bill 443: Expands the institutions which certain recipients of the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship are authorized to attend. (BDR 34-352)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 443 was heard by the Committee on May 25, 2023. This bill expands the definition of eligible institutions for the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship to include an accredited, tax exempt, nonsectarian college or university that operates a clinical program within the state in which students enrolled in the college or university receive training.

Section 2 of this bill makes a student eligible for the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship if the student enrolls in at least 12 semester credit hours in the course of study at such college or university for which the completion of a clinical program located in the state is required. A representative from the Nevada System of Higher Education testified during the bill hearing and indicated that there would be no fiscal impact because of this piece of legislation. If the Committee wishes to approve this bill, the motion would be do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 443.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. 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:

We discussed this bill last night, and the Committee's motion had to be rescinded because Fiscal staff needed to do some additional analysis. This bill originally provided a State General Fund appropriation of approximately \$21.6 million and a State Highway Fund appropriation of approximately \$5 million for the costs associated with the implementation of an Enterprise Resource Planning System.

In addition, the bill provided a one-time General Fund appropriation of \$36,425 and Highway Fund appropriation of \$8,544 for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software for the operation center of the Enterprise Resource Planning System. The Smart 21 system modernization is no longer being pursued, and a new system is being contemplated. The estimated cost for that system was identified as approximately \$206 million by the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor. However, that also included a component that was for additional modules, which could be funded in future biennia. During the hearing, the Committee asked the Office of Finance to provide a revised estimate that eliminated the portion of the original estimate for the additional modules. Their revised estimate totaled \$166.3 million, consisting of \$10 million in American Rescue Plan Act funds, \$126.6 million in General Fund appropriations, and \$29.7 million in Highway Fund appropriations.

Because this has not been a fully contemplated request, the Committee may wish to consider putting the General Fund appropriation and the Highway Fund authorization into the restricted Interim Finance Committee Contingency Account and request the Office of Finance to return when the plan has been fully vetted to seek that additional funding. The Office of Finance still requires the \$36,425 in General Fund appropriations and a one-time Highway Fund authorization of \$8,544 for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software that was included in the original one-shot appropriation. With those various adjustments, the motion would be amend and do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions on the amendment to this bill? [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. (ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 489.

Assembly Bill 489: Makes appropriations to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor for the replacement of furniture and certain equipment. (BDR S-1112)

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 489 makes appropriations to the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor for the replacement of furniture and certain equipment. This includes a one-time State General Fund appropriation to the Budget Division, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor of \$130,945 for replacement office equipment and a one-time General Fund appropriation to the Division of Internal Audits, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor of \$24,201 for replacement of furniture and videoconference equipment. There were no recommended or proposed amendments to Assembly Bill 489. The motion would be do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 489.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 491.

Assembly Bill 491: Makes appropriations to the Nevada System of Higher Education for enrollment recovery at certain institutions. (BDR S-1180)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 491 was heard by the Committee on May 23, 2023. The bill makes an appropriation to the Nevada System of Higher Education totaling approximately \$12.6 million, which is comprised of \$420,503 for Great Basin College (GBC) enrollment recovery; \$11,560,948 for College of Southern Nevada (CSN) enrollment recovery; and \$593,495 for Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) enrollment recovery. This is because of declining enrollment at GBC, CSN, and TMCC; all three campuses experienced budget reductions resulting from caseload funding reductions driven by a decrease in the weighted student credit hours. The Governor's recommended enrollment recovery one-time funding is intended to offset the funding reductions and hold the institutions harmless at their adjusted base funding levels for the upcoming biennium.

During the bill hearing, representatives from the Nevada System of Higher Education explained a budget amendment which also incorporates Western Nevada College as well as Nevada State College. They revised the amounts to reflect how the calculations were accounted for in the budget closing. The amounts in section 1 would be revised from \$420,503 to \$419,595; in section 2, the amount would be revised from \$11,560,948 to \$12,139,324; and in section 3, the amount would be revised from \$593,495 to \$1,012,772.

There were two new sections that were proposed in the amendment. However, the amounts in section 4 were also adjusted from \$246,150 to \$297,917. In section 5, the amounts were adjusted from \$911,297 to \$855,490. If the Committee wishes to make those adjustments to this bill, the motion would be amend and do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 491.

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 present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 494.

Assembly Bill 494: Makes an appropriation to the University of Nevada, Reno, for the addition of weighted student credit hours resulting from the acquisition of Sierra Nevada College. (BDR S-1177)

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 494 makes a State General Fund appropriation of \$1,649,534 to the University of Nevada, Reno, for the addition of weighted student credit hours resulting from the acquisition of Sierra Nevada College. The amounts were calculated based on weighted student credit hours from students who were enrolled at Sierra Nevada College in fiscal year (FY) 2022, who then enrolled at the University of Nevada, Reno for the fall 2022 semester, multiplied by the FY 2023 weighted student credit hour value, which is the value that was consistent with the caseload calculation in the budget. That value was \$166.90 multiplied by weighted student credit hours of 4,745.

Additionally, there was over 3,300 square feet of dedicated research space that was identified at the campus at Incline [the University of Nevada, Reno at Lake Tahoe]. That square footage was accounted for and had a \$9.83 per square foot operations and maintenance cost applied to it. The weighted student credit hours totaled \$791,915. The operations and maintenance costs were \$32,852 for a total annual cost of \$824,767, and a total cost of \$1,649,534 for the 2023-2025 biennium. There were no amendments considered for this bill. If the Committee wishes to approve the bill, the motion would be do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions or comments? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 494.

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 present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our work session agenda will be 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)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

This bill was discussed last night. It relates to the Department of Corrections' request for various computer hardware, software, and purchase of replacement vehicles and X-ray

scanners. There is a staffing study that is requested as well as outdoor exercise areas, garbage trucks, metal detectors, replacement of stab-resistant custody vests, utility carts, inmate food delivery, equipment, and various other items.

The Department of Corrections requested an amendment and included a proposal to reduce the cost associated with switch hardware from \$3,220,392 to \$2,822,306. They also recommended reducing the one-shot funds for the Humboldt Conservation Camp by \$40,000 due to its closure and recommended reducing the one-shot funds for Warm Springs Correctional Center due to its closure, which was \$230,284. They suggested utilizing that savings and replacing that with additional one-time purchases related to ammunition and firearms totaling \$240,000. If the Committee wishes to consider the Department of Corrections' request to replace their existing one-shot appropriations with the revised amount of \$240,000, the motion would be amend and do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for the explanation of the bill, the amendment, and your patience in pulling this off the agenda last night. Members, you have the amendment in front of you and the original bill. In the amendment, there is a reduction in section 4, section 16, and section 8 for Warm Springs Correctional Center and Humboldt Conservation Camp and the switch hardware. My suggestion for the Committee is to accept those amendments, however, not accept the amendments for the additional one-shot purchase for the operating ammunition, munitions, and ammo storage lockers. Are there any other questions or comments? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 507.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I appreciate the amendment and will vote for it because I know the Department of Corrections (DOC) needs this, but could we hear from DOC about the reductions, or the justification why they do not need that ammunition and the lockers for the weapons, if possible?

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The reductions were for the facilities that are closed, not for the ammunition. They wanted to move that money and purchase additional guns and ammunition. Are there any other discussions on the amendment or the bill itself? [There were none.] We have a motion on the floor.

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. Our basket is empty of bills, and we need to go to the floor. We will recess this meeting [at 11:09 a.m.].

[The meeting reconvened at 4:23 p.m.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Good afternoon, and welcome back to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. We will start on our third revision of our agenda for the day. Our first bill on the agenda is Assembly Bill 119 (1st Reprint), which creates the Vulnerable Adult Fatality Review Committee.

Assembly Bill 119 (1st Reprint): Creates the Vulnerable Adult Fatality Review Committee. (BDR 38-311)

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

This bill was a product of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Judiciary. The bill came through the Assembly Committee on Health and Human Services.

Assemblyman David Orentlicher, Assembly District No. 20:

Assembly Bill 119 (1st Reprint) creates a Vulnerable Adult Fatality Review Committee along the lines we already have for child fatalities. The idea is to study when there is maltreatment of an adult to make sure we can develop policies to protect our vulnerable adults. There was a fiscal note because of the role of the Office of the Attorney General in implementing some of the policy. The conceptual amendment [[Exhibit C](#)] redefines the role of the Office of the Attorney General to make it more appropriate and removes the fiscal note.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The amendment that you are referring to—this is the conceptual amendment that we received that made some policy changes but no fiscal changes, correct?

Assemblyman Orentlicher:

Correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, you should have the amendment [[Exhibit C](#)] on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System, and you have the bill and the fiscal aspects of the bill. All the fiscal notes have a zero fiscal impact.

Are there any questions for Assemblyman Orentlicher? [There were none.] We will move to support for A.B. 119 (R1). Is there anyone who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there any testimony in opposition?

Lisa Partee, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I want to oppose this bill A.B. 119 (R1). We have such a top-heavy government right now. We do not need to create yet another agency or committee and impact us more fiscally. This session has been nothing about anything but impacting us fiscally. Please vote no on A.B. 119 (R1).

Kasey Rogers, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

For the record, I would echo what Lisa Partee said and oppose this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there any more testimony in opposition? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in the neutral position? [There was none.] Are there any closing remarks? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on this bill. Because this is a fiscal committee and the fiscal notes on this bill are all zero, we can go ahead and process this bill. I will open the work session on A.B. 119 (R1) and entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 119 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Hafen:

This is the fiscal Committee, and the fiscal notes have been removed, so I will vote yes to get it out of Committee, but I will reserve my right on the floor to change my vote because I have some concerns over the policy.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

I have the same concerns.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I have the same concerns.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, we are going to rescind that motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS RESCINDED THE MOTION TO DO
PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 119 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI RESCINDED THE SECOND TO THE
MOTION.

Is there any other discussion?

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

I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 119 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ANDERSON, WATTS, AND YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign all the floor statements to myself. I will open the hearing on the next bill.

Assembly Bill 138: Provides Medicaid coverage for certain types of behavioral health integration services. (BDR 38-332)

Jeanette K. Belz, representing Shatterproof:

I am grateful for the opportunity to present Assembly Bill 138 today on behalf of Shatterproof, which is a national not-for-profit organization dedicated to reversing the addiction crisis in our nation. I am especially delighted to do that today because today is the last day of Mental Health Awareness Month. This bill came from the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services.

Briefly, A.B. 138 requires the State Plan for Medicaid to include behavioral health integration models, such as collaborative care, as part of its covered services. The collaborative care model is an effective way to provide integrated and comprehensive care to patients with mental health conditions. It provides reimbursement for a team-based approach that involves the patient's primary care provider, care coordinator, and a consulting mental health provider, a psychiatrist or an addiction medicine specialist. This allows patients to receive coordinated mental health care in the setting that they are most familiar with; their primary care provider. I would like to thank Stacie Weeks, Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, for diligently and patiently working with us to address the fiscal note that the Department submitted on February 9, 2023.

Before we discuss the fiscal note, I wanted to let you know that there is an amendment that was submitted to the Committee [Exhibit D] that delays the implementation date to July 1, 2024. Based on that, the Department reduced its fiscal note. I am hoping that someone will confirm that from the Department.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Do we have anyone here from the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy?

Lynnette Aaron, Administrative Services Officer 4, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services:

With the amendment to delay the effective date to July 1, 2024, the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy can revise our fiscal note. The total cost for the biennium will now be \$659,445, including \$212,073 in State General Funds.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenter or the Department about the fiscal note? My question for the Department is will you be able to absorb that \$212,073 cost?

Lynnette Aaron:

No, unfortunately, we will not be able to absorb those costs.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] We have an amendment to the bill and an amended fiscal note. Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 138?

Lea Case, representing Nevada Psychiatric Association:

We have two members who are heavily invested in this bill who currently run programs that will be impacted by this. They are using grant funds and patching the funding together. That is the pediatric access line. That is where a pediatrician can do a phone consultation with a child and adolescent psychiatrist specialist to do accurate prescribing. There is the high-risk pregnancy center, and they help pregnant women who may be living with a substance use disorder or an alcohol use disorder while they are pregnant, and this helps them maintain a healthy pregnancy. Both of those are currently using grant funds and providing these collaborative care funds will help make those programs sustainable and get healthy moms, babies, and children.

Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

We were at a conference in October in St Paul, Minnesota, where this model was being rolled out and presented at a national level. The Nevada Psychiatric Association is in support as is the American Psychiatric Association. This will be a way to extend mental health services to more people. As we end Mental Health Awareness Month, access to care is important. I urge support for A.B. 138.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else to provide testimony in support? [There was no one.] Is there any testimony in opposition? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in the neutral position? [There was none.] Do the presenters have any closing remarks? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on this bill and open the work session on A.B. 138.

Members, you have heard that there is an amendment on the bill that changes the date for implementation, which affected the fiscal note. We will need to authorize \$659,445 and appropriate \$212,073 from the State General Fund. I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 138.

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 present the floor statement on this bill. The next item on our agenda is
Assembly Bill 216 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 216 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing travel insurance.
(BDR 57-198)

Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow, Assembly District No. 35:

I am pleased to present Assembly Bill 216 (1st Reprint). After the first reprint, the Department of Taxation determined that the fiscal note should be removed. We have a zero fiscal note.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for Assemblywoman Gorelow on A.B. 216 (R1)? [There were none.] There are no fiscal notes on this bill. Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 216 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there any testimony in opposition? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in the neutral position? [There was none.] We will ask the presenter if you have any closing remarks. [There were none.] I will close the hearing on this bill and open the work session. I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 216 (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 present the floor statement on this bill. We are going to take a one-minute recess to switch places [at 4:45 p.m.].

[Assemblywoman Backus assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Backus:

We will call this meeting back to order [at 4:46 p.m.] and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 519.

**Assembly Bill 519: Establishes provisions governing capital projects of school districts.
(BDR 34-1202)**

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1:

For those of you who are watching, this is a little different. It is not just a fiscal presentation; this is also a policy presentation as well.

I am happy to present to you today Assembly Bill 519. This bill makes desperately needed appropriations to support capital projects for Nevada school districts while establishing a new provision that governs county funds for capital projects. Most notably, this bill includes an appropriation of \$64.5 million to the Elko County School District for the construction of a new school to replace the Owyhee Combined School. I have my copresenters joining me, who will introduce themselves, and we will present the bill and the fiscal aspects of it.

Brian Mason, Tribal Chairman, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation:

I deeply appreciate A.B. 519 that is before you today. The bill does a lot of things in amazing ways. I have read it. I have looked at it. Other people have looked at it. It is being reviewed up and down. So far, I have not heard anything bad. Well, that is not true. I did hear one bad thing, and I have to explain that and put it in context. The one negative thing that I heard was from an individual who is an official, not here in the county—I will not name the county to protect the individual's stupidity—but he argued that why would the state of Nevada spend money on a school that is on tribal land when they do not pay property tax? The simple answer to that is even in this year of 2023, tribal members living on reservation land cannot own property. That is a fact even in 2023. That is through no fault of our own. It is simply the law. I appreciate the fact that the Committee has found a mechanism to replace a school that is falling apart. This bill does that, and I appreciate all the hard work that so many people put into this bill.

William Adler, representing Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation:

We have been representing the Duck Valley Indian Reservation this whole session, and it has been a long and arduous process to get to this point. I want to thank everyone for hearing this bill today and all those who got this bill to where it is, including Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen, Assembly District No. 32, for introducing the first measure to get attention and Chair Monroe-Moreno for the time she spent on this.

The measure before you is one of a lot of compromise, negotiating, and a lot of love. It is going to do a lot of things for the state of Nevada. If there are any questions after going through the bill and the presentation, I will explain each section, the reasoning behind those, what they intend to do, and what they shall do going forward in Nevada for not just Native American students but rural Nevada as well.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

I want to give you a concept of why we are here, because this is a big ask. The Owyhee Combined School is located at the Shoshone-Paiute Tribe of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation in northeastern Nevada. The conditions of the school are completely unacceptable and putting the health and education of Nevadans at risk. It has become so severe that school administrators reported bat feces dropping from the ceilings. This appropriation is critical to give the people of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation a school that they deserve.

The bill makes two appropriations of \$25 million to the newly created Account to Assist Rural School Districts in Financing Capital Improvements. The first appropriation is for funding grants to school districts, and the second is for grants for capital projects on qualified tribal lands. You may ask why two appropriations? My research of this bill and my conversations with our congressional delegation informed me that there is a federal fund available for states that have dedicated funding for tribal schools. The state of Nevada never had that. Those are the dollars that we have been missing for a number of years. It is a big ask now, but by passing this piece of legislation, it will bring in many dollars in the future to help our schools.

This new fund will help provide support to our rural school districts to ensure that we do not see schools deteriorate to the level that the Owyhee Combined School has. The bill also requires the Elko County Board of Commissioners to levy a tax at a rate of not less than one cent and not more than 25 cents on each \$100 of assessed valuation of taxable property. This money must be deposited in the county treasury to be directed to the fund for capital projects. Similarly, any board of county commissioners whose population is less than 100,000 may levy a tax required to fund capital projects for their school districts.

We thank Assemblywoman Hansen for bringing forth the initial bill, but I felt we should be doing more. We had a fund for rural schools that for years has been sitting there and was not being utilized. I found a way to not only utilize that fund but to expand that fund to take care of all our schools no matter where they are located, but especially our schools on our tribal land. When we think about it, we are all guests here on their land, and it is time for us to step up and do the right thing for our tribal members. Their children are our futures just like all our children, and they deserve to go to school at a healthy school, and this will get us there.

I want to thank some of our mining communities, our resort communities, and others because the way this fund is set up, it can accept grants, donations, and contributions. I see this as the first step to solving a number of problems in our state when it comes to our tribal schools. With that Madam Vice Chair, we will stand for questions.

Vice Chair Backus:

I want to thank Chair Monroe-Moreno for bringing this bill and being our star when it comes to grant money and finding those extra federal funds. I know a lot of people are watching, and it is a big ask. I know there have been a lot of struggles with that property, including it being a used building before it was relocated to the Duck Valley Indian Reservation. I would ask Mr. Adler or Tribal Chairman Mason to elaborate on some other things. We know about the bats that hang in there and when it rains, the bat feces come through the ceiling, and some of the classrooms are the kitchen or the home economics room. Would you provide more explanation and talk about some of the other problems? Are you going to have other people appear?

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

We have the vice principal of the school on Zoom. We would like her to speak about the conditions of the school.

Lynn Manning John, Vice Principal, Owyhee Combined School, Duck Valley Indian Reservation:

I am a citizen of the Duck Valley Shoshone-Paiute Tribe and a resident of Owyhee, Nevada located on the Duck Valley Indian Reservation. My formal education as a kindergarten student began at Owyhee Combined School. I graduated from this school in 1994. Both of my parents graduated from this school, and my eldest daughter is set to graduate from here in less than two weeks. I have other children who are in grades 1 through 11, all of them here at Owyhee Combined School. My mom is a former teacher here. My dad is a former bus driver here. I am now the Vice Principal, having been a school administrator in both Clark County School District and Washoe County School District prior to returning home to this school and community that has educated three generations of my family over a span of 65 years, with many more on the horizon.

The situation at the school can best be described in two categories: facilities and location. The first issue with our facility is inequity. Our facilities lack basic amenities that are standard in schools within our district and the state, including lacking certain Americans with Disabilities Act accommodations. The amenities that we do have are old, often out of order, and beyond their useful life. Some aspects of the school are crumbling. Our location is unsafe. The front doors are 100 feet from a major highway. Full glass and fully accessible doors are open to passing motorists and, unfortunately, anyone with ill intentions. A city street bisects our campus with no designated or safe student spaces to pass between periods or gather during lunches. Our campus is adjacent to, and sits directly on, a hydrocarbon plume. This is a situation that has developed over the last 70 years that the school has been in existence. In 2023, these circumstances are unacceptable. We are nine teachers short going into the 2023-2024 school year. We need a school that can both attract and retain highly qualified licensed teachers.

I would like to thank the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means and Chair Monroe-Moreno for hearing us—the citizens and residents of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation—and the past, current, and future staff and

students of Owyhee Combined School for the future of our tribe and state of Nevada. Further, we are asking for the unanimous support of the Legislature in passing A.B. 519 and pray that Governor Lombardo signs the bill into law. I echo Tribal Chairman Mason and his appreciation of the work it took to get us here including the work of Assemblywoman Hansen and Senator Hansen for their support.

Vice Chair Backus:

Your daughter has been such a good advocate here in this building. We are going to present questions to the individuals, unless you want to talk about the amendment, Mr. Adler?

William Adler:

Yes, two things. I would like to discuss the amendment [[Exhibit E](#)] proposed by Ken Higbee, Director of Special Services, Elko County School District, and we can go through that. Today, it looks like section 6 is the core of what will be added from the amendment to the bill. It is worthy of discussion and leads to a discussion about the bill. Section 6 now has a new subsection 6, created as a two-part process. When these counties enter into an agreement to start levying a local tax upon themselves that they collect at the local level, there were two things missing, and additional public input was needed. The counties needed to have the ability to have a sounding board, so the community knows where these revenues are going, how they are collected, and on what they are being spent. Public concerns are valid, and public meetings provide comfort to the rural counties and other counties.

What is going to happen to these accounts once they start collecting money is important. There was no trigger mechanism for the counties to explain to the tribal communities and the public how and when they planned to spend the funds. Having that public board based around the county commission and the school district with a small membership that is locally based, would work in almost any county that implemented one of these provisions. A tribal member is included on the board. Almost any county that would go into this agreement would have a tribal community invited to be a member of one of these boards when implemented. It would not necessarily have to be when they are building a tribal school either. It could be whenever they enter one of these agreements. An invited tribal member from a local tribal community would be a good mechanism to keep this a functional mechanism going into the future. A lot of people agree with the need for additional revenues and collection of those revenues for infrastructure for schools, especially in rural Nevada. But a lot of people want their hands around it and want to know how that is going to work and how they are going to be involved with it publicly. That is the purpose of section 6, and it does add a needed element.

I would like to go through the bill briefly to link the sections where they belong. Section 1 is a reference section, but section 2 is the new language added to the bill. Section 2 is explicit and links the "shall" language and the mandate of it only to one county by population; that happens to be Elko County—I will say it right here on the record. It does say that this Commission can levy a 1 cent to 25 cent tax of their own choosing to enter this account. Elko County shall do this in this way in section 2 for the purpose of raising funds to spend

explicitly on tribal lands. Section 2 links the bill to section 10. If you look at section 10, Nevada is appropriating \$64.5 million to Elko County School District for the building of and the maintenance of the Owyhee Combined School.

A lot of construction projects have overages; a lot of projects do not end up with 100 percent of the budget accounted for at the beginning of it. Today, that is our best guess of the cost, and that estimate came from Elko County School District as the budget for what it would take to build a new school in Owyhee. It was \$77 million, and the Tribe can put up so much, and the state is providing the rest of \$64.5 million. Section 2 of the bill is going to create an account where the county can then start passing their own bonds and figure out an amount, from 1 cent to 25 cents, that works for them to start saving money in their own account in their own treasury. That money can then be used or applied against the money available in section 9 of the bill, which contains funds that can be used for rural school use and \$25 million for additional tribal school use.

The interpretation is clear, section 2 is a mandate for Elko County to create one of these accounts to start accruing that money. That money could have a tangible use soon. If the cost of building the Owyhee School does go over, they will then have funds saved up already that they can apply to make sure the school gets completed. There is no idea that the state of Nevada would have to come back and complete that final piece of it. The cost of the school is encompassed in this bill. This is a prudent measure to put in place to say we are paying for a school, but we want to make sure it gets done, and the funds will be there to finish it as well. This is a well thought out, prudent measure that links Elko to the funds received in section 10.

Section 3 creates a statewide mechanism that will go on and continue. Any county with a population of 100,000 or less can enter into an agreement to levy a similar tax upon their own property of 1 cent to 25 cents for the purpose of collecting funds to build a school. It does not have to be a tribal school. This is allowable for any school across the district. Similar cases would be White Pine County and other places where they are at their tax cap, and they have had problems going forward and getting that financing directly. The rest of the bill is self-explanatory, and there may be a couple of questions here or there. Section 3 sets up the new mechanism. Section 4 has the state account that will match some of the funds and details how those funds can be accessed. Then going back through it, the appropriation piece comes in with section 9 and section 10.

Section 8 says if Elko County does not choose to enter a taxable agreement themselves or put the 1 cent to 25 cent tax or bond in place, then a 25-cent tax shall be levied upon them in the same way they could have chosen to one year later if it has not been put in place by that year. That is the core of the bill. It does have a lot of structure too, but it sets up an in-depth forward-looking structure for fixing some hard-to-fix issues in rural Nevada where school financing and funding is limited, especially on a per-pupil basis.

Vice Chair Backus:

To clarify, when you are looking at the conceptual amendment, you started talking about section 6. Is that the only portion of the amendment that is a friendly amendment?

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

Yes, as you look at the conceptual amendment, there were three bullet points. I am not accepting bullet points 1 or 2 but will accept bullet point 3. This was not typed up or created by an attorney, but by Ken Higbee, Director of Special Services, Elko County School District. It is not in legal language. We can have a mock-up amendment presented to the Committee to get it into legal language if you do not like the way it is written now. Bullet point 3 is the only part that is a friendly amendment.

Vice Chair Backus:

Members, are there any questions?

Assemblyman Hafen:

I must thank Assemblywoman Hansen, and everyone involved in this. I know from day one, this has been a difficult conversation. We are talking about a substantial amount of money and putting the work in to solve this problem is huge. What I love is how you expanded this. You are saying that we are going to go over and above and fund the account to assist rural school districts. This is going to be an enormous benefit to all the rural counties. I cannot say thank you enough.

My question is about section 10. I want to make sure that I fully understand section 10, subsection 3, that indicates that the remaining balances would revert to the State General Fund. I want to confirm that this is not going to be the new taxes that are going into the Account to Assist Rural School Districts in Financing Capital Improvements, and the General Fund reversion would only be the portion that was the \$64.5 million. I want to make sure of that.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

That is correct. That is only referring to the \$64.5 million that was appropriated.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

My question is for Tribal Chairman Mason, and it is not related to the language in the bill. It has more to do with processes that I have heard about over the last few years, as others have in education as well. The school will be on tribal land. Is that correct?

Brian Mason:

That is correct.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

My question has to do with the relationship and/or the way discussions are held between the tribal nation and the school board that oversees this. If there are differences of opinion, how is that being handled? Because yes, this is about the money, but this is also about the policy

because I do not believe it is being heard any place else. I was wondering how you are planning on handling any differences of opinion and differences in how things are taught? I have heard there have been some issues with school districts and school board trustees not always respecting differences of opinion.

Brian Mason:

That is a good question, and I would love to answer it. I am the Chairman of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes. In the past years, it may have been difficult, but it is getting better with constant communication with the school district itself. Before 1995, the school district had levied an English-only policy where tribal members could not speak their own language. That affected staff, janitors, and children. Children would go home and talk Shoshone or Paiute to their parents and grandparents, but if they went back to the school and spoke their native language, they were disciplined. It was the same with the janitors if they were talking Shoshone or Paiute to their nephews, children, daughters, and sons; they were disciplined as well.

The relationship has not always been good, but like I said, it is getting better. We have a professional working relationship now that we have been self-governed since 1994. We are growing our own educators and administrators like Lynn Manning John. We can only be optimistic about the situation. We are fine. The school is on tribal land. We have a lease with the school district. We have already dedicated a lease to be \$1 a year for the next 20 years.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Thank you for that clarification and for allowing me to ask that question. I know that is one reason some of the schools are in disarray currently because of a lack of respect for differences.

My other question is regarding section 4. Would you explain about the administration of the money? Section 4, line 18 states that the money would be put into the state treasury to be administered by the Director of the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor. Does that mean that the money would be approved first or is that process something that would be in the regulations and would be discussed as listed in section 5, subsection 5?

William Adler:

It may be more appropriate to ask the Office of the State Treasurer how they interpret doing this. I have been told that there would be a statewide account to house the funds received in section 9. You would end up with \$50 million, of which \$25 million is dedicated to tribal-based school buildings and \$25 million for other rural schools. The mechanism is a match grant where they enter a plan to accumulate funds under section 3 of the bill, and a local county begins taxing themselves. The Office of the State Treasurer then has a granting mechanism and has figured out the timeline for when the funds would be acquired from that tax. The Office of the State Treasurer would then come to an agreement with the grantor of the amount of the match. I do not want to speak for the Office of the State Treasurer.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

Like everyone else, we are appreciative of this bill coming forward. It was heartbreaking hearing from staff, tribal members, and especially the students coming into our offices and telling us about all the issues that are going on with the school.

First, I want to tell you that in my conversation with some of the students, I asked them what they would like in their new school, and they said a track. They would like a track where animals are not crawling across it because they mentioned that there were cows that liked to roam the track and the football field, and a mountain lion that was hanging out one Friday evening when they were having a football game. I told them I would advocate that for them. My question is, do we have a timeline for when the school would be open and what is the capacity for how many students it would accommodate?

Brian Mason:

I can speak to that. I have some construction background on major projects at both active mines in the state of Nevada and in communities where I worked with Barrick Gold Corporation in government relations with the tribes. We would go to tribes and build different buildings such as senior centers, community centers, and those types of buildings. The Tribe is optimistic, and we have already started with the initial ground surveys and initial studies that we are going to need. We are in contact with the Nevada National Guard, Office of the Military, and the U.S. Air Force that are going to do some leveling of the land. All these things that we are doing right now are up-front costs that are going to assist in taking some of the bite out of the end costs, which we are referring to as in-kind that we are doing up front.

We are hoping that it is going to be done in two years, and that is not a big stretch. I built a large senior center in Owyhee when I was with Barrick Gold Corporation, and that took six months, but it was smaller. We are working on the timelines, logistics, and have been talking with the architects who are going to design it. We are working with them and have worked with them before. Those are the architects who the Elko County School District works with as well. Realistically, we are looking at two construction seasons, and we are not counting this year as a construction season. We are going to do all the infrastructure work, and then hopefully it is done before my term is up, which is in three years.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I love this. It is brilliant. I am excited about it. I have a question related to the oversight panel. It is a legal question on the quorum for this panel and whether the Open Meeting Law applies to it. The reason I am asking is because we have had several hearings this session about the difficulty of appointing individuals who will show up at these meetings. I am curious about the intent for this panel to be subject to the Open Meeting Law and that structure. Is there a potential opportunity to include some flexibility to ensure these positions are filled by individuals who will do the work?

William Adler:

I do believe the more flexibility, the better. This was a reduced accountability panel that was like the Washoe County School District one that we did. That one seemed too heavy for a rural school district with too many members and too much participation. I wanted to pare it down to something manageable. As far as section 6, subsection 6, I agree that in a lot of cases, there might not be a tribal community in that county that wants to participate in a school issue because some of them are small, and some do not have their own dedicated school. Additional flexibility added to the language will be better. I envision it being a public meeting or something that could be held before or after a school board meeting as it is linked to the school board and their practices as well. Beefing that language up would be great. I believe Mr. Higbee would agree to make it as legally sound or permissible as possible. Having a public meeting once a quarter does not seem too onerous. Having a public meeting gives us a place for the public of that county to know what is going on. I did envision it being public.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

To add to what Mr. Adler said, we have approximately 28 tribes in the state of Nevada that have not always been welcomed or invited to have a voice and a seat at the table. I think having people to fill these positions will be easier because now we have provided that invitation. We want you to be a part of the discussion about how to make your community, which is all our communities, better.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I want to clarify that the complaint has come from local governments not showing up to these meetings. How can we make sure that there is flexibility in who they appoint or who gets appointed to these committees who can represent the local governments? I agree with you that the invitation and mandate that there is a member who is a representative of a tribal community is important because otherwise it often gets overlooked. I appreciate that.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

Now that we all know about the situations at some of our schools, our rural communities, and our tribes, we all have a responsibility as elected officials to make sure that the legislation we enact gets followed. I know I am committed to making sure this is done, and I think I can speak for Assemblywoman Hansen—she will be out there making sure that it is taken care of as well.

Assemblyman Miller:

I cannot echo ditto enough to many of my colleagues' comments about how great this is. The excitement of a new school, right? We have a new school, a new building with all the bells and whistles that will hopefully be there. I have a two-part question. The principal and Chair Monroe-Moreno mentioned several of the issues with the current building. During the building of the new school, are there going to be repairs done in the meantime while we are waiting for the new school to be built? Secondly, what happens to the old school when the new school is built?

Lynn Manning John:

Regarding the current situation and any needed repairs, the Elko County School District is already taking steps to address some of our glass issues and the bat issues. We have had a ton of rain today, so I do not want to go in that classroom, but I will check it out before I leave today. Every day we are working to address the needed repairs. It is a lot, but we do it every day. As far as the structure itself, it is owned by the Elko County School District and was transferred to the Elko County School District from the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the 1950s. It is real property of the District. I cannot speak to the District's intentions.

However, in the instance that it comes back to the Tribe, I have had some thoughts about what it could be. It could be a business incubator, or it could be a cultural center. We are right on the highway. It could be a great tourist space. The Nevada Indian Commission, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs works with tribal communities in creating tourism on tribal lands. That could be an aspect. I thought about a tribal college, a technical school, or an alternative school. I am a popcorn machine of ideas. It is a good building. It is an old building. It is not sufficient for a school for children, but that does not mean it does not have a purpose. Having been a Las Vegas resident, I know there is a tendency to want to knock something down and start fresh. At the same time, I know in Reno, the Mapes Hotel that used to sit along the Truckee River was beautiful. I was sure sad to see that go because there are some beautiful historic buildings, and this is one of them. I am seated here now, and it does have a use after it is no longer a K-12 school. I believe Ken Higbee, Director of Special Services, Elko County School District is present in the audience, and he may be able to speak to that as well.

Assemblyman Miller:

That was good enough. I do hope that the District sends the school back to the Tribes because everybody loves popcorn and those are some great ideas.

Vice Chair Backus:

Committee members, do we have any other questions for our presenters? [There were none.] We will open testimony in support of Assembly Bill 519.

Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association:

We are going to say "me too" to everything else. This is a great bill. We would urge your support.

Christina Erling, Vice President, Government Affairs, Barrick North America:

Barrick Gold Corporation operates Nevada Gold Mines with our joint venture partner Newmont Corporation. We appreciate the opportunity to express our support for A.B. 519. At Nevada Gold Mines, we recognize that we have an obligation to be responsible stewards of the environment, good neighbors, and dedicated community partners. To achieve this, we proactively look for opportunities to partner and engage with our host communities including our Native American partner tribes to address community needs in a sustainable and adaptable way. Our approach to successfully partnering with our communities is simple. We foster solid, long-term relationships with community stakeholders that are built upon trust,

transparency, and respect. We were honored to support members of the Duck Valley Shoshone-Paiute Tribes for the trip here to advocate for the new school. We are dedicated to the longtime partnership we have with the tribes of the northern Great Basin, and we are here in support of their efforts. We believe A.B. 519 is a proactive, positive step for the tribes toward the need for their school.

Ken Higbee, Director of Special Services, Elko County School District:

I am here in support of A.B. 519. Being a lifelong Nevada educator, as well as the son of a lifelong Nevada educator, I have seen the difficulties in funding schools in rural Nevada. This is a breath of fresh air to have a mechanism for our rural schools to build schools. I would call it a visionary bill to help our schools with capital improvements. This is a legacy bill. Your legacy in moving this bill forward is going to be felt through generations of children in rural Nevada. For the first time ever in the state of Nevada, we have a mechanism, and so I thank you for that. I see all the division in the world today, and funding for children should not be divisive. Elko County supports Owyhee, and Superintendent Anderson has been a huge proponent of the Owyhee Combined School. We are dedicated to making this happen.

Morgan Biaselli, representing Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation:

I am here to read a letter from James Phoenix, Tribal Chairman, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe.

Good morning, Madam Chair and members of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee. I am Chairman James Phoenix of Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe. It is a good day for fellow tribal leaders, and I thank you for recognizing the importance of the future of our native children as expressed through this bill. In most tribal communities, we lack the population size and visibility to call attention to our children's educational needs. They deserve schools that are safe, modern, and long lasting. Assembly Bill 519 creates a mechanism and funding for schools on tribal lands as well as for schools in other rural communities here in Nevada that truly need it. It will allow our communities to support our youth as they prepare for their futures. In closing, I thank you, Madam Chair, for your leadership in creating A.B. 519 on behalf of the tribal nations here in the great state of Nevada. We request your support for Assembly Bill 519.

Sarah Adler, representing Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation:

With your permission, I would like to share testimony from the honorable Warren Graham, Chairman.

Good afternoon, Madam Vice Chair, and members of the Committee. I am Warren Graham, and I am proud to be the Chairman of the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe. I join you this afternoon to express my deep appreciation to Chairwoman Monroe-Moreno and to the Hansens in strong support for

Assembly Bill 519. Perhaps you have not visited our community. It is 295 miles from Las Vegas, 290 miles from Reno, and 47 miles from our nearest neighbor community, the town of Eureka, including on unpaved roads. Even more importantly for this bill, we are 302 miles from Pahrump, which is where the headquarters of the Nye County School District is located. That is our county.

This year we are celebrating the 50th anniversary for our Duckwater Shoshone Elementary School. The Duckwater Shoshone Elementary School building is over 50 years old. Since it is an old building, there are always maintenance issues, which also means most of the school is outdated with limited funding to resolve its challenging issues. I imagine this will help you realize the critical importance of A.B. 519 and the Account to Assist Rural School Districts in Financing Capital Improvements. Our Tribe is a community of truly native Nevadans, yet we lack the population size to allow our children to be treated fairly in terms of their schools compared to those in other Nevada communities. Assembly Bill 519 gives us hope for our children's future and the opportunity to work with the Nye County School District to provide our children with a learning environment that respects them. With A.B. 519, you welcome them into this state and their future. On behalf of my community and Tribe, I thank you and request your support of A.B. 519.

Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents:

We are in support of A.B. 519. We are excited to see our fellow students at Duck Valley Indian Reservation get a healthy, safe environment in which to go to school. We also appreciate the opportunity for other rural districts to take advantage of the opportunities that this bill offers. We had White Pine County school children here today in the Senate Committee on Finance talking about how they wanted to replace their 105-year-old school that they are still using. This is a good bill; we appreciate it; and we support it.

Michael Hillerby, representing White Pine County School District:

I am happy to say the White Pine County School District is a pro bono client because the money they do have should go to those fine young children that Superintendent Pierczynski mentioned who were in the Senate Committee on Finance this morning. The White Pine County School District is happy to support the provisions of the bill and those provisions dealing with being able to enact a tax outside of the tax cap. White Pine County has been at the tax cap since 1997. Their voters have a long history of supporting ballot questions but again, they are at the cap and have nowhere else to go.

There are two schools that White Pine County is hoping to replace soon. There is an appropriation in the Senate for some money. We are hopeful between the provisions of this bill, hopefully some money from Senate Bill 100, and money from the State Infrastructure

Bank from their conversations with the Office of the State Treasurer would help them replace two schools that are more than a century old with one combined school to serve the District's needs. I am happy to support this bill and thank the Chair for bringing it forward.

Jennifer R. Lanahan, Esq., representing Las Vegas Paiute Tribe; and Reno Sparks Indian Colony:

Thank you so much for taking the time to hear about this bill and bringing it forward. We urge your support.

Vice Chair Backus:

Before we go to the phone line for support, we want to ask Dr. Higbee if you could come back up to the podium. One thing we were curious about was the existing structure. I know it was an older building when it was placed on the Duck Valley Indian Reservation. The Committee members would appreciate knowing your intent for that building.

Ken Higbee:

This is a monumental task that this bill is going forward. The building is unsafe, and that is the reality. We are looking at turning the building over to the Tribe and allowing them to use it in a manner to make it useful. That would include tearing down some of the building that is not useful or safe. I think we would be turning that building back to the Tribe.

Vice Chair Backus:

We are not holding you to that, Dr. Higbee. We appreciate that, and I am sure you appreciate the government-to-government relationship, and we trust everything hopefully will work out going forward. Are there any others who would like to testify in support of the bill?

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

We would like to take this time to thank the sponsor of the bill, Chair Monroe-Moreno. We wholeheartedly think this is a commonsense bill and long overdue.

Henry Thorns, representing Dog Catchers Youth Foundation:

I am calling on behalf of support for A.B. 519. Growing up in Las Vegas, I got to know some Indians on the corner of the main street where eventually a school was built, but they never had a school. This is awesome for them to be building the school and do not stop there. Do not stop with one. I think you should continue building more schools and the real history of their language and everything will come out and be taught at the school. At the same time, I hope this is a stepping stone for other schools that could be rebuilt and remodeled in the Historic west side. I support A.B. 519, and anything for the children.

Lelani Thorpe, Private Citizen, Owyhee, Nevada:

Thank you, Madam Chair, and members of the Committee, for allowing me to speak. I am a descendant of the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes here in Owyhee, Nevada. I am in support of A.B. 519. I am here to talk to you today about our current Owyhee Combined School, which is nestled in the beautiful Duck Valley Indian Reservation. The current school houses our future generation, and it sits on top of a hydrocarbon plume, which is an environmental

health disaster. It poses a health disaster risk for every student, teacher, and community member who continues to congregate at the Owyhee Combined School while the plume remains in the area. We have had many community members diagnosed with cancer. Unfortunately, one of them was my mother, and she lost her battle in 2017. She not only attended and graduated from the Owyhee Combined School, but she was also employed there as an aide for some years. I cannot say for sure whether this toxic plume was a factor in her cancer diagnosis, but it well could have contributed.

Now, do not get me wrong, I will always love our Owyhee Combined School, our home of the Owyhee Braves. The school has had many generations of our families walk its halls. In my immediate family alone, there have been four generations there to be exact. Not only does the danger that sits underground pose a risk, but our teachers and our future students deserve pride in their school. They should feel like they matter, and getting an education is of paramount importance. The school has no heating system. I mean it does, but the boiler system does not provide sufficient heat. The cooling system consists of opening a window and that poses a risk as well when you have wasps and mosquitoes coming in carrying many diseases.

I ask how children are supposed to learn in these types of environments when we have no heating system that is sufficient and no cooling system that is sufficient. If you take one look at our school, you will see that it is a soft target for many school shootings that happen in our nation. You walk in through glass doors, which is an easy way to get in. The current and future students of Owyhee Combined School need a school that can provide them with extracurricular activities such as safe and sturdy playgrounds, a weight room that can help athletes to perform at their best abilities, and a gym that can house a weight room as well as working showers for those students who come and play against our team. Students need a lunchroom where they can eat because right now, they are sitting in a classroom as the makeshift lunchroom.

We also need reliable Internet to provide enough bandwidth to the students so they can get their testing done without the Internet crashing. But at the end of the day, our children deserve a new school; one that helps them to believe, achieve, and succeed, which is our school motto, in their studies and extracurricular activities; one that encourages them to be proud of being an Owyhee Brave. Our teachers and future teachers deserve a school that can help them feel safe, secure, and provide a better education for our students. Having a new school would provide pride in our whole entire community. I ask that you make this a reality for our current and future students. I thank you for your time, listening to me, and thank you to Assemblywoman Hansen.

Vice Chair Backus:

Is there any more testimony in support of A.B. 519? [There was none.] We will take testimony in opposition to A.B. 519. [There was none.] Is there any testimony in the neutral position? [There was none.] We will invite the presenters to come back for some closing remarks.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

I think you have heard how important this bill is. Sometimes people ask me, what do you do in the Legislature? What is the job of being an Assembly member? I jokingly say we do the Lord's work in the People's House. But today, by hearing and voting for this bill, we are truly doing the Lord's work in the People's House.

Brian Mason:

I would like to thank you for hearing our statements, listening to the bill, and putting together a good bill that makes sense to everybody. This is a great thing. It is visionary like Ken Higbee mentioned. It is fixing something that happened in the 1950s that no one addressed. That is what leaders are—they confront problems, and they fix them. I appreciate all of you.

Vice Chair Backus:

I want to make one comment to you, Chairman Mason. When I met with you earlier this session, I saw you as a leader and knew you were going to do this for your school. I am excited. I will close this hearing formally.

I received permission to work session A.B. 519. I will open the work session on A.B. 519 and accept a motion. The motion I would be seeking would be to amend and do pass and the amendment would be bullet point number 3 on the conceptual amendment, which was a modification to section 6 regarding the establishment of a School District Capital Projects Oversight Panel.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 519, WITH CONCEPTUAL AMENDMENT BULLET POINT 3, WHICH IS A MODIFICATION TO SECTION 6 REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPITAL PROJECTS OVERSIGHT PANEL.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno will present the floor statement on this bill. We will take a one-minute recess [at 5:46 p.m.].

[The meeting reconvened at 5:47 p.m.]

[Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The next bill on our agenda for today is Assembly Bill 245 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 245 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing education. (BDR 34-818)

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3:

Today, I am here presenting Assembly Bill 245 (1st Reprint), which works to expend resources for victims of power-based violence across the state education system. I am going to get right into the fiscal note, and there is currently no fiscal impact to the state. The amendment adopted in April as the First Reprint allowed the Department of Education to remove its fiscal note. I will answer any questions that the Committee might have.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions for the presenter? [There were none.] I invite anyone to the table who would like to testify in support of A.B. 245 (R1).

Alejandro Rodriguez, Director of Government Relations, Nevada System of Higher Education:

The Nevada System of Higher Education is in support of A.B. 245 (R1). We appreciate working with Assemblywoman Torres on the language of the bill, and we urge your support.

Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association:

I am speaking in support of A.B. 245 (R1) related to victims of power-based violence. We supported this bill in the policy committee. We are here in the money committee supporting it as well. We urge your support.

Serena Evans, Policy Director, Nevada Coalition to END Domestic and Sexual Violence:

On behalf of the Coalition and our 13 program members, collaborators, parents, and student survivors statewide, we support this bill.

Kent M. Ervin, Ph.D., State President, Nevada Faculty Alliance:

We support this bill.

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

We are in support of this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

Barbara Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I appreciate what is being attempted here, having been teaching in the classroom myself. The concerns I have are the strong terminology power-based violence. There are a lot of rules already for bullying and behavior problems. I know we should be doing better in

helping treat them. But the definition in section 4.3 of power-based violence talks about so many things without limitation like dating violence, domestic violence, gender-based violence, gender-based harassment, and violence based on sexual orientation or gender identity. We are not in favor of harassing anybody. There are things that you can do for sexual misbehavior, which is already in the statutes. Then it gets so much more complicated. Is indecent exposure violence? Are they going to be subjected to these outside agencies to help, and we do not know who they are? It is getting so complicated with the socialization and the indoctrination of the children instead of the basics.

That is why our schools are low because Nevada used to be ahead of California when I was here. We were way up, and we did not socialize the children. We took care of behavior problems as they came up. I did some substitute teaching in East Los Angeles. Gang people walked in and wanted to have a fight in the middle of my class, but you deal with it. It is so complicated now.

Those are the objections I have for voting against it. Then we have the Assembly, the Senate, and the Governor and all these people getting involved as well in this new Commission they are setting up. It is more than we need and a little dangerous to me that we do not know who the outside agencies are that are going to be helping. It is not clear enough. I appreciate what is being attempted, but I do not think it solves the problems. I would urge you to vote against it. I know there are some other discipline bills up. They are not even enforcing simple things like bullying, which is not violence, it is a control issue. I have testimony from parents that many of the schools do nothing about it. This is so complicated.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for joining us tonight and for your comments. Is there anyone else who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 245 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position on this bill?

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

I was trying to call in with testimony in support.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will move your testimony to support.

Dora Martinez:

I want to thank Assemblywoman Torres for sponsoring this amazing bill. The Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition supports her, and we hope you pass this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there any more testimony on this bill? [There was none.] We will ask the presenter if you have any closing comments.

Assemblywoman Torres:

First, I want to make sure that I acknowledge the work done by Amanda Vaskov, a University of Nevada, Reno student and graduate who worked on this bill. Second, I want to state that I have worked closely with Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen, Assembly District No. 32 and Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen, Assembly District No. 36 on a definition of power-based violence that I think is going to make everyone happy. I will be introducing that as a policy amendment on the floor.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 245 (R1). We will open the work session on A.B. 245 (R1). This policy was amended in the policy committee. It has no fiscal notes on it now with that amendment. I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 245 (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 present the floor statement on this bill. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 266 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 266 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to governmental
administration. (BDR 20-120)**

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3:

I am presenting Assembly Bill 266 (1st Reprint), which works to expand language access plans to cities and counties across our great state. I am happy to answer any questions relating to the policy, but for now, I will dive into the fiscal note attached by the Office for New Americans, Office of the Governor, which would be the principal agency tasked with overseeing this work.

The Office for New Americans, Office of the Governor requested an additional \$188,910 over the 2023-2025 biennium to coordinate and manage the creation and implementation of language access plans for local governments. This fiscal note includes \$137,841 for personnel expenses that include hiring a program officer position to serve as a language access coordinator to execute the responsibilities outlined in this bill. Also, a \$35,000 one-shot appropriation is needed to contract with language access experts during fiscal year 2023 to assist with the initial implementation of the bill and coordination of local

governments. In total, this appropriation would make 2.7 million Nevadans eligible to receive translated public notices in their native languages and expand accessibility of government in 17 Nevada counties.

I would briefly mention the associated fiscal notes from local counties and governments. We have contacted all entities who submitted the fiscal notes for this bill, as introduced. With the amendment adopted on April 14, 2023, a number of local governments have either removed or reduced their fiscal notes. I stand open for any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

You referred to the local government fiscal notes. I do not see any amendments from them. I see one from one county. I still have a fiscal note from the City of Reno. I do not know if there is anyone in the room who would like to speak to that? As far as the State General Fund, there is only one fiscal note, and that is from the Office for New Americans. If there is anyone here from that Office, I would like you to speak to that. I also have a proposed amendment from Clark County [[Exhibit F](#)]. Have you seen that amendment?

Assemblywoman Torres:

Yes, I have seen the amendment from Clark County, and it is considered a friendly amendment. It is pushing back the implementation date for local governments so that they can go through the hiring process, recognizing that hiring for October for local governments is quick.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Will you be doing that as a personal amendment on the floor since it will not impact the fiscal note, or will it impact the fiscal notes?

Assemblywoman Torres:

I am happy to do it as a personal amendment on the floor.

Charina de Asis, Director, Office for New Americans, Office of the Governor:

We do have a fiscal note for a program officer position. Looking at all the additional tasks that this bill adds, the Committee knows we have a small budget and cannot absorb any of these tasks given that we have only three positions. One position is an administrative assistant. We have a lot to cover in the state because 20 percent of our population are immigrants and refugees, and we have a large portfolio. Given that and how this bill outlines what is mandated for the language access coordinator, we believe that a fiscal note is warranted to give us at least one position to coordinate among the cities, counties, and the state agencies as well.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenter?

Assemblyman Watts:

I know that we have been working on language access issues. We moved forward with a bill related to creating funding for the Executive Branch to implement language access plans. I am wondering whether that could be used to assist the Office for New Americans in carrying out the provisions of this bill?

Assemblywoman Torres:

I would like to answer that.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I have the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, and that might be the most appropriate office to answer.

Amy Stephenson, Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor:

I do not see a problem with using that pot of money. The purpose of that was to help implement the language access plans. If this is implementing a language access plan, I do not see a problem with it.

Assemblyman Watts:

That is good news.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

There are no other questions for the presenter. We will move to testimony in support of A.B. 266 (R1).

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

Language access is vital for people with disabilities and other accommodation needs. This includes those who use things like braille and American Sign Language, which are considered alternative forms of language that others may not have considered. We hope that some of the language that was specifically mentioned including translators and interpreters used by the counties will also cover those who use languages such as American Sign Language. We appreciate the hard work of Assemblywoman Torres on language access plans. I know that she has several bills addressing this at this session.

Eric Jeng, Acting Executive Director, One APIA Nevada:

One APIA Nevada is advocating for the growing Asian American community here. I want to say ditto in support.

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

We would like to say ditto to the prior callers and thank you to Assemblyman Watts for asking an important question and thank you to Assemblywoman Torres for bringing forward this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will move to opposition. Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 266 (R1)? I will remind our testifiers to limit your testimony to two minutes.

Barbara Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

Education is such a big issue for me, and I see where it has gone. At the front of this bill, it compensates the student to sign for training purposes as a student teacher, counselor, student social worker, trainee in a library, or certain professional charter schools that can have a certain professional development training, and I would not necessarily agree with the course that they are requiring that they mentioned to get an associate degree. They get paid. Also, in some of the sections, they are not improving the accreditation of teachers. I have watched them with provisional teaching certificates until they can get up to speed. They are getting fewer qualified people, and this bill does some of that. I am going to say no to Assembly Bill 323.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for your testimony, but we are hearing A.B. 266 (R1). Is there anyone else who would like to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 266 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony?

Nic Ciccone, Legislative Relations Program Manager, Office of the City Manager, City of Reno:

I want to provide clarification on our fiscal note. This will still have additional requirements for the City of Reno. This is a step in the right direction, and that is why we did not testify in opposition. We revised our fiscal note to address the fact that Assemblywoman Torres had noted that we would not be liable for translations that might not be directly accurate. We will need a staff person to translate some of the more complicated items when it comes to development services, which can often be more complicated with planning.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The proposed amendment from Clark County pushes out the effective dates. Would that be helpful?

Nic Ciccone:

That would be helpful.

Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County:

I was working quickly on amendments and did not get around to all my local government friends about our proposed amendment. I am here on behalf of Clark County. We have been working with Assemblywoman Torres. We filed an undetermined fiscal note because we knew it was going to be a burden. We were trying to figure out how to quantify it for you. If Clark County needs a translation, we have been relying on our court partners. The scope has been narrowed down to our planning commission notices. For context, Clark County has an estimated 200,000 notices that we send out annually on our zoning items. We cannot give

that workload to the court. I do not think that would be fair. We are contemplating hiring translators. I think the funding that was discussed today and the resources that you could put into the Office for New Americans would assist the local governments in coordinating and building the framework that we need for translation services in the state. Flexibility on the date will help us. We are happy to work with Assemblywoman Torres on the floor amendment if this should pass to the Senate. We are neutral.

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

I would also like to express my thanks to Assemblywoman Torres for working so closely with local governments to address our concerns with the bill as introduced. As amended, our fiscal impact has been significantly reduced. We will still incur some expenses. The fiscal costs were \$2.37 million for fiscal year (FY) 2024, and we are down to the updated cost of \$343,000. For FY 2025, we were at \$1.85 million, and we are now at \$858,000. For the biennium, we are at \$1.2 million and in future biennia at \$678,000 per fiscal year.

I have not had a chance to rework the math based on the Clark County amendment, but I do think that it would reduce some of our expenses further in FY 2024. We appreciate the additional time to be sure that when it is time to go, we are ready to do so correctly.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Do we have anyone else who would like to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 266 (R1)? [There was no one.] Are there any closing comments? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 266 (R1). Members, we have spent a lot of conversation tonight about the fiscal note on this bill and part of it can be removed. However, there are other issues with the fiscal note. I am going to turn it over to our Fiscal Analyst to explain some of those things.

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

I would note that the one-time appropriation of \$25 million that is being recommended by the Governor for consideration is specific to state agencies. It appears that within the fiscal notes for this bill, one position for the Office for New Americans would be assisting local governments. That may not be an appropriate use for the one-shot money.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, to move this bill forward, if we wanted to work session it tonight, we would need to appropriate the money on the fiscal note so that the Office for New Americans could bring on that program officer position, and that position would be there to assist our local governments in this transition. To do that, we would need to amend and do pass the bill with that appropriation, and I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 266 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 323 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 323 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-114)

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3:

Thank you for the opportunity to present Assembly Bill 323 (1st Reprint), which aims to build the next generation of Nevada educators by removing financial administrative barriers for licensure for prospective educators. For the sake of time, I will speak solely to the fiscal note of the bill. I am grateful to the Department of Education (NDE) for the months-long collaboration on this bill and others. Through these conversations, we were able to reduce the fiscal note by 80 percent with the first reprint of the bill.

The fiscal note reflects the need for the identification of the fiscal impact related to directing the Superintendent of Public Instruction to develop a plan to recruit educators; drafting and promulgating regulations, which would require staff support; setting the practice for pedagogy exams, which would also require staff support; and contracting with a nationally recognized organization. As such, NDE identified an impact of \$2,786 in fiscal year (FY) 2024, and impact of \$200,000 in FY 2025. The Department did not identify future biennia costs.

The Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) submitted a fiscal note concerning the bill as introduced in reference to expenses relating to the Incentivizing Pathways to Teaching Grant Program. This portion of the bill was removed with the reprint of the bill, and NSHE submitted a new fiscal note for the first reprint of the bill, which indicated no fiscal impact at this time. The Department is here to speak on the fiscal note if there are additional questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

There is a proposed amendment [[Exhibit G](#)] that was presented on May 24, 2023, and that amendment affects the fiscal note.

Assemblywoman Torres:

We worked a lot on this bill over the last couple of weeks to make sure that it was ready to process. I will defer to them whether the mock-up amendment would affect the fiscal note.

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

Based on the mock-up Assemblywoman Torres mentioned, our revised fiscal note is \$2,786 in FY 2024, and \$200,000 in FY 2025. Those costs are included in the mock-up for the amended language.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenter or the Department? [There were none.] We will go to testimony in support of A.B. 323 (R1).

Alejandro Rodriguez, Director of Government Relations, Nevada System of Higher Education:

The Nevada System of Higher Education is in support of this bill, and we appreciate Assemblywoman Torres' work on it.

Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association:

I am also speaking in support of this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Do we have anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 323 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 323 (R1)? [There was no one.] Does the presenter have any closing comments? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 323 (R1). Before we go to a work session, we have a question.

Sarah Coffman:

I want to clarify the mock-up amendment for this bill. Would the reduced cost of \$2,786 for FY 2024 and \$200,000 for FY 2025 still need to be provided?

Craig Statucki:

That is correct. That is the reduced amount from the original fiscal note that we submitted on the original version of the bill. That is our final fiscal note.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Your testimony was that it was taken care of in the mock-up that was presented tonight. We will still need to appropriate \$2,786 for FY 2024 and \$200,000 for FY 2025 into this bill to move it tonight. I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 323 (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 present the floor statement on this bill.

[[Exhibit H](#) was submitted but not discussed and is included as an exhibit for the hearing.]

A number of the bills on our agenda are bills from legislators who are not members of this Committee. Next, we will hear the bills from those who are not on this Committee who do not have to be here so they may leave. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 301 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 301 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public employees. (BDR 53-766)

Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts, Assembly District No. 13:

I am here to present Assembly Bill 301 (1st Reprint). I will give you some quick background, so you know what it is that we are trying to do. Current existing law covers police and firefighters under what is called "heart and lung protection." The *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) do not cover all police. They do cover firefighters, so we are lucky there, but they do not cover all police. The intent of the bill is to include school police officers, juvenile probation officers, bailiffs, deputy marshals of municipal courts, and marshals and deputy marshals of cities or towns for certain benefits under the Nevada Occupational Diseases Act.

During the hearing in the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor, there was discussion about Clark County's fiscal note. I have worked with Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County to decrease the fiscal impact, and her amendment [[Exhibit I](#)] was submitted to you last night. I fully endorse that as a friendly amendment. What that will do is revise the effective date of the bill from July 1, 2023, to July 1, 2024, which allows that government and all local governments to properly plan and budget for the increased pool of eligible employees and extends the eligibility to all category I police officers to fund under NRS 289.460. This will bring parity with Clark County to cover their Clark County Department of Public Safety officers also known as Park Police.

I have also been working with the Risk Management Division, Department of Administration to address their fiscal note that was submitted at \$1.8 million for fiscal year (FY) 2024—that would be eliminated under the proposed amendment. The following concerns about the wording were expressed. Let me give you the exact page. In A.B. 301 (R1), section 1, subsection 2, the new language speaks to the use of any designation of the Department of Public Safety. Beginning with that paragraph, on line 33, if we were to remove the two words "or employee," that would then eliminate almost all of their fiscal note. Their concern is that the two words "or employee" would include any employee of the Department of

Public Safety (DPS) whatsoever, when the intent is simply to cover the commissioned peace officers. Using their math, that would reduce the cost to cover the 22 Capitol Police officers who are category I authorized positions. I do not know if all the positions are filled now—I doubt it. The cost is \$1,278 per annual physical and the total fiscal impact is \$28,116 per year. This is delayed for one year, so we do not have to worry about that cost until FY 2025. I do have representatives from the county and the state here. I stand for any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

When I looked at your bill, I was concerned that you are extending this benefit to those who were not category III, category II, or category I Peace Officers' Standards and Training Commission (POST) certified. It will only be for POST-certified category officers, not civilian staff benefits for the record, correct?

Assemblyman Hibbetts:

That is correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

You have mentioned the fiscal note from the Risk Management Division. Is that still \$1,819,868 or has that been adjusted, and if it has, do you have anything in writing?

Assemblyman Hibbetts:

I will allow them to address that. We were discussing it in the hallway while we were waiting for this hearing.

Matthew Tuma, Deputy Director, Department of Administration:

We were discussing our fiscal note with Assemblyman Hibbetts and some of the unintended consequences as we were reading the legislation that was in section 1, subsection 2, adding any employee within DPS. The bulk of our fiscal note was built around the 748 positions within DPS that are not sworn officer positions, and what the potential cost liability would be for extending the benefit to those individuals. If we remove the words "or employee" and focus this only on adding the additional 22 Capitol Police officers, Assemblyman Hibbetts is correct. The cost for physicals on an annual basis would go down to \$28,116. We would expect a much lower benefit of workers' compensation claims to come out because of that as well because instead of going from a pool of 770 individuals, you are going to a pool of adding 22 individuals. That is a marginal increase in additional claims like how we discussed that issue in legislation before the Committee yesterday.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will ask you to submit that to us in writing, so I have it for the file. Then we can work session this bill to move it out of this Committee and onto the floor.

Matthew Tuma:

I will submit that in writing to you. You will have it by the morning.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The next question is the Risk Management Division is not funded with State General Funds. It is fee funded. Are you able to absorb this additional cost?

Matthew Tuma:

Like some of the legislation that we discussed yesterday with the Risk Management budget, when there is an increase in our liability or workers' compensation liability, it is an obligation that the state will have to pay. We administer that budget account. As we go forward, if there are work programs that are necessary to pay those obligations, then we request approval from the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to pay those obligations. They are funded from reserves initially. If reserves are not sufficient, then we work with the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, the Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, and the IFC, on what a potential rate change mid-biennium would be if there are no reserves.

As I said yesterday, workers' compensation is one of those categories where we have seen some increases in expenditures recently and have been in front of the IFC every fiscal year to increase the expenditure budget. We have discussed and worked on ways of increasing the baseline budget to help address some of those continuing increases in costs that we are seeing as a state. It is a relative question about what happens in that given fiscal year.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions for the presenters? [There were none.] I will open testimony in support of A.B. 301 (R1).

Richard P. McCann, J.D., Executive Director, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers:

I am a member of the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition. You have heard about some good work done by the people who have these fiscal notes. I want to give a special kudo, however, to Clark County, that you are going to hear from in a moment for this reason. They have decided to backload their fiscal note to give themselves a chance to budget for this expense. Most people do not budget things unless it is something they want or something they expect. I must give a shout out to Clark County. They expect and they want this benefit for our officers, and that is a partnership. We have a partnership with Clark County going forward on a heart and lung situation that often runs into problems fiscally. They have done a yeoman's job. Everybody else you have heard from here today, has done a yeoman's job. We think this is a bill that needs to go forward. We think it is a bill that needs to pass out of here today and move on to where it needs to be. This is the time for it. We believe that there is a monetary basis for it. We think this Committee can do so, and we support this matter completely.

John Able, Director, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association; and representing Las Vegas City Marshals:

I thank Clark County and all of you for promising a work session, and we support the bill.

David Ballantyne, Vice President, Police Officer's Association, Clark County School District:

I want to thank you for hearing this bill, and we urge your support for our members.

Matthew Caldwell, President, Police Officer's Association, Clark County School District:

I want to thank you for hearing this bill. It is an important bill. This could potentially save one of our members' lives. Heart and lung issues are important, and having proper screening and diagnostics done could save somebody's life. It is an important bill to move forward.

Yolanda Tanaka, Private Citizen, Nevada:

I want to thank Assemblyman Hibbetts for bringing this bill forward. I am in favor of preventative medicine. I am asking for a yes vote on A.B. 301 (R1).

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 301 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 301 (R1)?

Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County:

I am here in the neutral position. We filed an amendment [\[Exhibit I\]](#) because we have been working with Assemblyman Hibbetts and Assemblyman Toby Yurek, Assembly District No. 19, on this measure since it was heard in the policy committee. Our amendment has the potential to address the fiscal impacts by moving the effective date to the next fiscal year so that Clark County can budget for the expansion of the pool of employees who would be eligible for this benefit. The proposed amendment will help us to address our fiscal note. Our original fiscal note was \$5.6 million over the biennium. With the new amendment, should it be adopted, our fiscal liability for FY 2024 would be zero.

Mr. McCann and Assemblyman Hibbetts mentioned this because the original bill added our juvenile parole officers. They are category II POST officers. We have our Department of Public Safety officers, formerly known as Park Police, who are category I. They are doing traditional police work. From an equity standpoint for Clark County employees, we felt that if we were extending this benefit for one category, then we need to offer it to all. We are expanding our pool voluntarily. For that reason, we asked for some time to budget for it. We filed with the Committee what the fiscal impact would be for Clark County. It does reduce it. We can certainly formalize that work with Mr. Tuma and Assemblyman Hibbetts. If we can do the amendment here, it would be of great assistance to Clark County. I can answer questions if you like, but we are neutral right now. I proposed the amendment to your Committee.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I do not believe we have any questions for you, but I appreciate you extending it to all categories because I do not care if you are a POST category I, or POST category II, or POST category III officer, if you are a law enforcement officer, you are doing the job of a law enforcement officer, then we need to protect all of our officers.

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

We were not able to quantify an estimate on the increase in claims in our original fiscal note. We did not have quite as eye-catching a number on our fiscal note as some of the others did. The amendment that has been presented this evening would eliminate the fiscal note that we had for FY 2023 and FY 2024. For FY 2025 it would increase ours slightly because we had an equity issue within the original bill language. This would add nine additional officers in our Department of Alternative Sentencing.

In the original bill hearing, you mentioned that over time, the way that local government staff and our law enforcement agencies change titles was not contemplated when the original legislation was put in place. The amendment that has been brought forth this evening would fix that once and for all. You may not have to see continued measures on this. We appreciate that equity issue. We are neutral on the bill and thank Clark County for the additional time to prepare and budget.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will invite the presenter back to the table. We have testimony on the record from Mr. Tuma that he will have information to us about the fiscal note in the morning, and you have accepted the Clark County amendment as a friendly amendment. We will amend the bill tonight. We will work session it and have that information in the file first thing in the morning, but we will work session it tonight for you. Members, you might see this dollar amount in a work session later at an IFC meeting.

Assemblyman Hibbetts:

May I add the reminder to remove the two words "or employee" from section 1, subsection 2, line 33?

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will make that change as well. We will close the hearing for A.B. 301 (R1) and open the work session for A.B. 301 (R1). I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 301 (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 present the floor statement on this bill. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 322 (1st Reprint) and invite Assemblyman Nguyen to the table.

**Assembly Bill 322 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to kratom products.
(BDR 52-763)**

Assemblyman Duy Nguyen, Assembly District No. 8:

I appreciate all your work on getting this bill out. This process has been quite interesting for this bill. We started with two fiscal notes that were approximately seven figures, but that has been corrected. Originally, the two fiscal notes were added by the State Board of Oriental Medicine and the State Department of Agriculture, and those have since been removed. I want to acknowledge the work of Cody Phinney, Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services, and Teresa Hayes, Environmental Health Program Manager, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, for their work on the fiscal note for kratom protection, which is less than what was originally submitted. I have those individuals here, but before I pass it on to them, I would pass it on to my copresenter, Mr. David Goldwater.

David Goldwater, representing Nevada Wholesale:

Kratom, as you might have remembered from the policy committee, is currently an unregulated substance. We are now going to place it under regulation of the state, and it properly belongs at the Division of Public and Behavioral Health. They have submitted a fiscal note. This is a particularly fee-funded activity. The industry agrees with adding the proper personnel and would accept this fee to be regulated accordingly. I will not go into any other policy because I know it is late and it is about the money so I will leave it there. There is some amendment language that has been submitted by Assemblyman Nguyen [[Exhibit J](#)] regarding some clarifications that the Division asked for as well.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Would this be the amended language that is submitted [[Exhibit J](#)]?

Assemblyman Nguyen:

Yes.

Teresa Hayes, Environmental Health Program Manager, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:

The agency currently proposes to replace the State Department of Agriculture on the proposed bill. The Division of Public and Behavioral Health currently regulates food establishments under Chapter 446 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) and *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) and food and drug manufacturers under Chapters 585 of NRS and NAC. Both regulations have the intent to provide unadulterated products to the public for consumption. I am here to answer any questions you may have today.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Does your Division have a fiscal note?

Teresa Hayes:

We do have a fiscal note [[Exhibit K](#)]. We submitted it as an exhibit. We would need funds from the State General Fund for fiscal year (FY) 2024 and FY 2025 totaling \$261,172. After we stood up the program, we would be able to run the program fee-funded after that.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

You would need the General Fund now, and then it would be fee funded, correct? Could you repeat the General Fund amount that you would need for this?

Teresa Hayes:

For FY 2024 and FY 2025, the total is \$261,172.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions for the presenters? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of [A.B. 322 \(R1\)](#)?

Erven T. Nelson, representing American Kratom Association:

The American Kratom Association is in support of this bill. The American Kratom Association is not a trade group. It represents thousands of Nevadans and millions of Americans who take kratom for various reasons for chronic pain relief and to help them stay off opioids, and they are in support of this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

Lea Case, representing Nevada Psychiatric Association:

The Nevada Psychiatric Association is in opposition to [A.B. 322 \(R1\)](#). As this is a money committee, I will focus mostly on the fiscal impact. There were some requested amendments from the Nevada Psychiatric Association that might have a fiscal impact including additional labeling that would warn consumers that this product may be addictive in some circumstances and has been known to cause addiction and death.

There is data that was submitted from the Washoe County Coroner's Office and the Clark County Coroner's Office indicating mitragynine has been the sole cause of death in several instances here in our state. I would also add that this is a prohibited substance by the U.S. Department of Defense. Our readiness in that respect might be impacted. We also ask that the minimum age for this be increased to 21 to purchase this product and sell it behind the counter so those age verifications might have a fiscal component. Finally, Medicaid rates for a per-day inpatient psychiatric program or detox facility are \$944 per day. A partial hospitalization program costs \$358 per day, and the cost is \$139 for a psychiatric evaluation, and the average cost of an autopsy is \$3,500.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for your testimony and all those issues that you brought up as this bill moves along the way. You might want to bring those up on the Senate side during the policy hearing. Is there anyone else who would like to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 322 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on this bill?

Michael Hillerby, representing State Board of Pharmacy:

I would like to thank the sponsor of the bill and the proponents for working with us. The revision language you see in the first reprint is different from the original bill, and it was part of the compromise to work on creating a system that looks something like the marijuana system in Nevada. There would be a legal path, and then there would be an illicit path if you bought kratom outside of that or attempted to sell kratom outside of that, that had been regulated.

The language in section 9.5, subsection 2 that would currently limit the State Board of Pharmacy's ability to schedule the substance should the facts warrant, and that would go through the public process—that was intended to be taken out. I understand from Mr. Goldwater that was in the language originally submitted in the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor and did not make it out. If the Committee is entertaining some of the amendments in the Pinyon Public Affairs memo [[Exhibit J](#)] that have to do with other parts of the bill, we would ask you to consider that as part of what we did. If not, I certainly understand and will bring this up when it comes to the Senate. I appreciate the Committee's consideration and would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The amendment that was presented tonight had an impact on the fiscal note from the Division. Your comments would be more of a policy issue. I encourage you to work with the sponsor to make that policy change either on a floor amendment or on the Senate side.

Is there anyone else who would like to provide testimony in the neutral position on A.B. 322 (R1)? [There was no one.] We will ask the presenters if you have any closing remarks?

Assemblyman Nguyen:

This is the first step. I know that kratom is already a legal product here in our state. This consumer protection act is a first step. The bill is not perfect. This is the first step to ensure that we set some guardrails for our communities and Nevadans to be able to navigate this product, prevent illicit activities from happening, and prevent adulterated products from harming our citizens. I look forward to working with some of the individuals who have presented testimony omitting certain things. We want to make sure that we have this as a first step so that we can put in more guardrails as we work on it.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

My question has more to do with the fiscal note when it was in the other department where there was a discussion about a tracking system database. It sounded like there was a hefty price tag. I do not know whether there is already a tracking system in place with it now moving into the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, or there will also be a need for a tracking system with that movement into the other Division. Do you know or does the Division know?

Teresa Hayes:

We already have a tracking system. We have the centralized licensing, inspection, and complaint system. We do all our permitting and registrations through that.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 322 (R1). Members, you heard the testimony on the bill that the fiscal notes have been adjusted. However, there will still be a fiscal impact, and we would need to appropriate that money into the bill, and for FY 2024 and FY 2025, that total is \$261,172. Could we have clarification because that is what we have in our notes?

Assemblyman Nguyen:

It is \$121,162 for FY 2024 and \$140,010 for FY2025 making it a grand total for two years of \$261,172.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Remember for the motion to amend and do pass, the amended amounts to be appropriated into this bill for FY 2024 would be \$121,162 and for FY 2025 would be \$140,010. I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 322 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I want to explain my position. I was a no vote on this when it was in the other committee, and I am going to stay that way.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I will be voting it out of Committee because the fiscal information is accurate, but I am uncomfortable with the policy of it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there any other discussion? [There was none.] We have a motion on the floor.

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

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will close the hearing on this bill and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 357.

Assembly Bill 357: Revises provisions governing sexual education in public schools. (BDR 34-163)

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Assembly District No. 34:

I am here to present Assembly Bill 357, which aims to enhance the standards of sex education provided in our public schools. It is crucial to note that *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 389.036 has remained unchanged since 1987, highlighting the pressing need for revision. By recognizing the importance of updated sex education standards, we are taking a significant step towards ensuring the well-being and future success of our students. To address these concerns, the Department of Education has taken the initiative to adopt the Nevada Academic Content Standards for health, which are available on their website. The Department will provide detailed information regarding the fiscal impacts associated with creating additional requirements in implementing these revised standards. I will now hand it over to Superintendent Ebert who will delve into the fiscal note and provide other insights into the bill.

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

The fiscal note is for our process of bringing in our constituents across the entire state so family members, teachers, administrators, and students can participate in the process of developing this curriculum for the wide, broad, and diverse community that we have within our state. You see the travel costs for traveling both to the southern part of our state as well as here locally in Carson City, and then also out into our rural areas. After the standards are developed, we want to make sure that they are implemented correctly. We have professional development available for our educators to make sure that they are implemented correctly. Our total fiscal note for this bill is \$115,609.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

My first question for you is what will your Department be able to absorb from that cost?

Jhone Ebert:

That \$115,609 cost is for additional work so we would not be able to absorb it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, do you have any questions on A.B. 357? [There were none.] I will open the hearing to anyone to testify in support of A.B. 357.

Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association:

I will keep it brief today. We are in support.

Paige Barnes, representing American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists:

We supported this in the policy committee and are here to do so in the money committee.

Cassandra Charles, Campaigns Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

We are also in support.

Serena Evans, Policy Director, Nevada Coalition to END Domestic and Sexual Violence:

Comprehensive age-appropriate sex education is violence prevention. We urge this Committee's passage.

Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am in support of A.B. 357 and appreciate the mental health references that are in here. Puberty and adolescence are a rough time and generate a lot of referrals to psychiatry. Maybe some of this could be useful.

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

Sexual health and sexual education are vital for all students. But as a reminder, it is also vital for students with disabilities. The rate of sexual assault among students with intellectual and developmental disabilities is staggeringly high, and all students should have access to education and opportunities that meet their specific learning needs. We do support this legislation.

Maria-Teresa Liebermann-Parraga, Deputy Director, Battle Born Progress:

We were in support of this in the policy committee and now support this in the money committee. Please support this bill.

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

I would like to ditto what the people before me said and Catherine Nielsen's comments.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 357?

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:

We oppose this bill. We are opposed to the cost of the bill, but there are many more costs. Ever since sex education was initiated in the 1960s, we have seen nothing but increases in teen pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, broken hearts and lives, and more government social services to pay for these things. We are concerned about this bill because it changes the entire way we have done it. It is antidemocratic, antiparents, antichildren, and antifamily. It removes from the local sex education advisory committees any meaningful role, and it puts

the responsibility in the Council to Establish Academic Standards for Public Schools to make a curriculum that is unavailable and unaccountable to parents and the public rather than the local committees and the locally elected school board. We are against that.

We are also against the fact that this bill changes who can teach sex education. Right now, it is restricted to teachers and school nurses. This opens it up to others in the public. They will be inviting groups with agendas like Planned Parenthood into the classroom, and we are significantly concerned about that. We are also concerned about broadening the subjects in it and the antifamily agenda, which it includes.

One of the final things we are concerned about is how it changes parental issues. Right now, it is an opt in, and this changes it to opt out. Parents must affirmatively say they want their children in it. That is how we want it. We want it to remain as opt in, not opt out, because that encourages parents to be involved with their children, which is what we all want. We want parents to be involved with their children. We ask you to oppose this bill.

Kathleen Palmer, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Assembly Bill 357 refers to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as the source of information about preventing pregnancy. But the FDA hides often lifelong harms born by the users of hormonal birth control. When compared to women who are not on the pill, women on the pill exhibit a 19 percent to 37 percent higher risk for breast cancer. An estimated 300 to 400 American women die every year from vascular diseases like heart attacks, strokes, and blood clots that are exacerbated by hormonal contraceptives. Two years ago, the nonprofit Women's Health Organization, Natural Womanhood, along with doctors and researchers, submitted a citizens' petition to the FDA citing the robust scientific evidence of the risks mentioned above. They asked the FDA for greater transparency and evidence-based warnings about the risks of hormonal birth control. They have heard nothing in response from the FDA on the evidence presented.

The Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford recently completed a study in March that shows that breast cancer risk declines after a woman stops taking birth control pills but remains elevated compared to women who have never taken hormonal contraceptives. The FDA does not acknowledge these harms. I checked the website today. That is true. Breast cancer is the world's most diagnosed cancer. Elevating the average teenager's risk of breast cancer through recommending hormonally based birth control should be a serious consideration for sex educators in Nevada. Please consider amending this bill to add the National Cancer Institute and the Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford to the list of information providers since the FDA is refusing to disclose some of these health problems mentioned above. These potential harms are of vital interest to teenage females and the women they will grow up to be. They deserve to have accurate and transparent health information presented in sex education courses.

Barbara Jones, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I was in education in the schools. I am going to say ditto. They explained it well. I will give one analogy about how long ago this started. About 30 to 40 years ago at Lake Tahoe, a

reference book in the library was how to be a lesbian with graphic descriptions for my middle school nephew. I went to the school library and talked to them about it. It was not appropriate for that age level to have that book. I am against it.

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I will ditto the previous and future commentators. I do have some alternative topics that we can educate our young people, if that is okay that I would like to share, such as the fact that many not so pleasant trends are happening. Record numbers of women are hitting their thirties, unmarried, unpartnered, and childless. This is a serious concern because they have passed their prime years and their fertility is going down. The family structure or family building has significantly declined over the last few decades. What is ironic here, especially in the state of Nevada, is a small minority of young adult women have college degrees because that is the excuse that they constantly make. We need to encourage men and women to be good candidates for marriage, high material, to build strong families. To build strong families, you must have the quality, which I will discuss hopefully at another time. But other than that, I am glad this topic is being brought up. I appreciate it. Please reconsider.

Jim DeGraffenreid, National Committeeman, Nevada Republican Party:

I am in opposition to A.B. 357 on behalf of the Nevada Republican Party. We testified in the Assembly Committee on Education on the policy dangers of having the state circumvent the ability of local school boards and parents to determine the sex education curriculum of Nevada schools. Here in the money committee, those issues are relevant because the state is proposing to spend \$115,000 to take over a process that is already being handled well at the local level, making A.B. 357 a waste of state resources. Although the fiscal note does not address future biennia, it is reasonable to assume that there will be a future cost to update and maintain this agenda, just as there is a current cost to implement it. We anticipate future ongoing unnecessary expenses as well.

Why do the sponsors of this bill think they know what is better for Nevada children than the parents of their children or their local elected school board members? This bill attacks local and parental control, attempting to usurp the role of discussions parents should have with their children on health and sexuality and instead spends state money to bring strangers with ulterior motives who do not work for the school district and are not accountable to parents into a school to have these discussions.

Section 2, subsection 2 is particularly disturbing with the phrase "to provide equally meaningful instruction to pupils regardless of their level of sexual experience." Why would this be happening in public schools? In Clark County, elementary school principals are being busted in sexual predator investigations by the police. If we are going to spend state money, let us use it to focus on keeping predators out of our schools rather than discussing sexual experiences with minors who cannot consent to sex. Please vote against spending state resources on issues that are being well handled at the local level and vote no on A.B. 357.

Lisa Partee, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

Please vote no on A.B. 357, which removes control of the sex education curriculum from local sex education advisory committees under the elected school board and gives it to a council that is not accessible, accountable, or overseen by the school district. We parents do not have a say in what is being taught. This is unacceptable. It changes to opt out rather than opt in and allows outside people to teach in our schools with an agenda like Planned Parenthood. It promotes antifamily and alternative lifestyles more than anything. We should not be teaching about sexuality. Sex education teaches children, or at least it used to, the biological way of reproducing, making babies, and discussing prevention of pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, and abstinence. Sexuality is an entirely different thing. This indicates that the teaching is going to be based on the idea that the children being taught are currently sexually active.

I am sending you an email with definitions of what sexuality means, and for the children it is the quality or state of being sexual; for adults, it is the condition of having sex or sexual activity. We do not want Planned Parenthood to teach our children about sexuality or anything for that matter. Planned Parenthood is a leftist socialist organization, and that is not an appropriate entity to be involved in our children's education. They have been successful in being one of the leaders of sexual education in schools, which is unfortunate. On their own website, they feel they are experts in teaching about relationships, and I do not feel their values and activism truly support healthy relationships. The nuclear family that is such a rarity these days may be demonstrative of that. We already have a committee within our school district that includes parents, students, and others. This subject is covered, and we already have difficulty in reining in what is being taught and promoted in our schools as it is. We do not need to hand the reins over to a leftist organization that brainwashes children as well as encourages full-term abortions.

Additionally, they want access to the children over several years of education. This is not necessary. What we need are people to teach responsible behavior and abstinence. Ideally, I wish parents would become more actively involved in this area, but we certainly do not need a council that is unaccountable to the parents and children to lead the charge in this area. Please do not throw our children to the wolves with this bill. I echo prior oppositional testimony as well. Please vote no on A.B. 357.

Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada:

We are opposed to this bill for many reasons, some of which are the bill would change who could teach sex education to our children. Right now, the school nurse or teacher teaches our children. Who would be coming into the classroom to teach our children? What would they be teaching? "Provider of health care or other person" is what this bill states. Will the taxpayer be paying these strangers to be in the classroom with our children? We currently have a system that most parents and taxpayers are comfortable with and have a say in—that is the sex education advisory committees. Each county has their own committee made up of parents and taxpayers in that county. This committee would be replaced with an appointed state "Council to Establish Academic Standards for Public Schools," which is unaccountable to the parents and public. How much money is involved to set this Council up, run it, and

run it for many years? I am sure it will not be cheap. We, the taxpayers who pay for all these bad ideas, do not want these changes: appointed state committees, opt out instead of opt in, strangers in the classrooms teaching who knows what, and teaching subject matter that is not age appropriate. We, the parents and taxpayers, say no to this bill. Check the opinion page—that tells the story. Vote no on A.B. 357.

Michael Ryan, Private Citizen, Nevada:

I am a long-time resident of Nevada and a Marine Corps veteran. Please vote no on A.B. 357, which removes control of sex education curriculum from local sex education advisory committees under the elected school board and gives it to the appointment and unavailable Council to Establish Academic Standards for Public Schools. This is undemocratic. It changes opt in to opt out, which lessens parental involvement. It allows outside people to teach in our schools with an agenda like Planned Parenthood. It promotes antifamily lifestyles. Please vote no on A.B. 357.

Kasey Rogers, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

Children are impressionable, and your attack on our children and families must stop. There are specific topics I do not agree with, which I will discuss further. First, I quote "when ignorance destroys culture, monsters will emerge," from Jordan Peterson. One of the best ways to understand something is to examine its beginnings. Alfred Kinsey, the pioneer of sexual research, studied children while he was sexually abusing them to get to his goal. He did horrific sexual experiments on them. Look up Table 34. He, to this day, is praised and celebrated in academia. John Money, on the other hand, coined gender ideology and was a psychologist and professor at Johns Hopkins University. Both men were pedophiles and leaders in the current movement of sexual education for our public schools. I must say there are eight billion people on this planet—all of them were born from a woman, including all of you sitting in the seats today. Every person in the audience was born from a woman; not one of you was born from a man. You want me to allow you to educate my child in gender ideology, all of which are lies to the nature of man. Please keep your pedophile, trans-humanist, Marxist agenda away from our children and families. Vote no on A.B. 357.

Theresa DeGraffenreid, Private Citizen, Douglas County, Nevada:

I am representing myself this evening as a Nevada resident of Douglas County. I know that the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means is a money committee. But for me, any money spent by the state to implement a one-size-fits-all policy is a waste of state resources when local school boards are already doing this work. Assembly Bill 357 seeks to take away the ability of local school boards, who are most accountable to parents, to set the sex education curriculum and determine the ages that are appropriate for this information. Instead, the state will set a one-size-fits-all curriculum, and, in addition, the state will require parents to opt out in place of the current opt-in system. We know from testimony on other bills in this session that the goal of this Legislature is to promote a statewide agenda that as many as half of Nevada parents oppose. Local control allows Nevada parents to direct local school boards to set a curriculum that aligns with their values. Assembly Bill 357 does not require that these subjects be taught by a teacher, or even an employee of the district, but specifically allows the subjects to be taught by strangers with ulterior motives from outside

the school system. In 2017, Assembly Bill 348 of the 79th Session was vetoed by Governor Sandoval, and that bill was identical to this one, and parents lobbied hard to defeat it. His veto message stated the reasons that this was a bad idea, and those reasons are just as valid today. His veto message conveyed the thought to not circumvent local school boards and parents' involvement with this bill. Please oppose A.B. 357 to protect Nevada families and children.

[[Exhibit L](#) was not discussed during the hearing but was submitted in opposition to Assembly Bill 357 and will become part of the record.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 357? [There was no one.] I invite the presenter to provide closing comments.

Jhone Ebert:

There are two items that I would like to point out given the testimony that was provided. The first one is regarding the school boards of trustees. The school boards of trustees must maintain their advisory committee, which consists of parents, pupils, medical, counseling, religion, and teachers. That remains in the bill. The other piece is we heard a number of callers address who can teach the course. Those people must be approved by the local school board. I know this is not a policy committee, but that was brought up several times, and I wanted to make sure that was pointed out in this bill.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

Thirty-four states plus the District of Columbia currently have an opt-out provision. Several states have nothing, and it would be automatic. As far as parental involvement, I think all of us who have children know you do everything online. If you wanted to opt your child out, it is as easy as opting your child out of being photographed, which comes up when you are doing that.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 357. I will open the work session. Members, you heard the testimony that the Department of Education would need the State General Fund appropriation of \$115,609 if we were to move this bill forward. I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 357.

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. ASSEMBLYMEN MILLER AND YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We have one more member who is not on this Committee. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 449 (1st Reprint) and invite Assemblywoman Gallant to the table.

Assembly Bill 449 (1st Reprint): Authorizes a credit or refund of property taxes under certain circumstances when an applicable partial abatement of taxes was not applied or claimed. (BDR 32-767)

Assemblywoman Danielle Gallant, Assembly District No. 23:

Assembly Bill 449 (1st Reprint) addresses the concern that many of our constituents had about eight or nine months ago when there were some mistakes with the property tax. It was increased to 8 percent when all those people were supposed to have a 3 percent increase. This bill ensures that should that mistake happen again, and we do not catch it, our constituents can be reimbursed going back one year.

When I originally introduced this bill, I naively thought a tax credit would be better. It turns out the municipalities must pay interest on the money that they are holding. I have worked with Washoe County, Humboldt County, Storey County, and Clark County as well, and discovered that a refund check would be a better idea. I worked with all of them to improve the process so that it would be seamless and easy for each of the offices of the assessor and the treasurer and would not add anything arduous to their process.

All the fiscal notes are zero because they could not determine a cost, thinking that we would have this credit. But now that it is going to be a refund, they are not going to have to pay any more interest. If you have any questions, I am here to answer them.

Assemblywoman Peters:

Did the municipalities absorb the cost of printing the checks?

Assemblywoman Gallant:

When I was discussing this with them, they said there are times outside of property taxes where they have had to issue refunds. It is something that they already have done. They were not sure how many, so they could not assess what the exact cost would be. Everybody I spoke to wanted to be able to have it in the statute to reimburse their neighbors. These are their neighbors, and they do not want to keep money that is not intended to be held by the assessors.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

I want clarification. You said that these are going to be refunds and not tax credits, is that correct?

Assemblywoman Gallant:

Yes, it would be a refund going back one year. It cannot go back further than a year or it would cause problems with their accounting.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

Am I missing an amendment? Section 1, subsection 2, says the taxpayer is entitled to such a tax credit or refund, or combination thereof. Should that be deleted, or am I missing an amendment? I have the first reprint.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

Where were you looking?

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

It is section 1, subsection 2, in the last sentence on lines 19 and 20.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

We can look into that. I had worked with the treasurers' departments to make sure that the wording was exactly how they wanted it so I could double-check with them.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

Okay.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] We will invite anyone to testify in support of A.B. 449 (R1). [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 449 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on the bill? [There was no one.] Does the presenter have any closing comments? [There were none.] I will hold this bill until we get the answer to that question about the tax credit, and then we will add it to a work session.

We will close the hearing on A.B. 449 (R1) and open the hearing on the next bill on our agenda.

Assembly Bill 249 (1st Reprint): Enacts provisions relating to the use of hemp in certain commercial feed. (BDR 51-719)

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15:

I am pleased to present Assembly Bill 249 (1st Reprint) for your consideration today. This bill was introduced by the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources. The goal of this legislation is to allow for the sale of hemp products in animal feed. Hemp animal feed is an emerging product area. It is specifically not allowed as feed for livestock because that is still a process that must go through the federal government. This bill would allow the use of hemp to be incorporated into feed for pets, specialty pets, and horses. That is what the bill seeks to do. I will turn the presentation over to my colleague.

Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24:

I am going to explain the fiscal note. The fiscal note is related to the fees required for the staff to ensure that this regulation can be undertaken. The fiscal note includes personnel, information services, operating, travel, uniforms, fees, and the basics needed by the State Department of Agriculture.

Assemblyman Watts:

One thing came up with the advocates while working on this bill. It was noted this is in Chapter 587 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). This is part of the commercial feed program, which has its own dedicated budget account. As part of the overall structure set up in NRS Chapter 587, it is supposed to be a self-supported account where fees are paid by manufacturers and distributors of feed. Those revenues help support the program activities. Currently, there is not a large operating expense from that category, and there is a significant ongoing reserve. That was a question that we were not able to get answered by fiscal representatives from the Department in advance—how the existing fee structure might help support and offset some of those costs in the fiscal note, and whether reserve reductions may be appropriate in any way. We wanted some clarification on that. The costs are necessary for carrying out this program. If somebody is here from the State Department of Agriculture, I would ask them to come up and speak to it. Otherwise, I will answer any questions that you may have.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

It would be good to have someone come up and speak about the fiscal note that was put on this bill. It is a substantial fiscal note, and I would like to know if the Department could absorb that. They are fully funded, and I want to make sure they have either vacancy savings or reserves. No one is here to address this fiscal note. Members, are there any questions for the presenters? [There were none.] We will move to testimony in support of A.B. 249 (R1). Is there anyone who would like to testify in support?

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

I would like to thank Assemblyman Watts and Assemblywoman Peters for bringing forth this bill. This is something that we have heard from the agriculture community that wants to utilize this product that they have in different ways. This is a unique situation and something that would be responsive to that community. We have an amendment to this bill [[Exhibit M](#)] that was added as a research amendment, and that is something that I think is also good for us, especially at the College of Agriculture as we continue to study the impacts of this. Assemblyman Watts said this is new and emerging. It is important for us to complete that research. We are in support.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there any more testimony in support of this bill? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in opposition? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in the neutral position? [There was none.] Are there any closing comments? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on this

bill, and we will wait to get more confirmation on the fiscal note. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 290 (1st Reprint).

**Assembly Bill 290 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing motor vehicles.
(BDR 43-620)**

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

This evening, you have a proposed conceptual amendment to this bill in front of you [[Exhibit N](#)] to revise section 1, subsection 3 to eliminate the seven days noted in the first reprint, which effectively eliminates the fiscal note to zero. I am pleased to report I have a representative in the audience from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to confirm that. I would respectfully request that we add an additional amendment to include Assemblyman Hafen as a cosponsor on this bill, as he was ill the day he needed to sign the paper. That is my presentation.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I see that the fiscal note is zero from the Department of Taxation.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

Correct, the Department of Taxation has submitted the form that you have, and the DMV is here to testify that with this amendment, their fiscal note is also zero.

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

We are neutral on A.B. 290 (R1) and appreciate working with the bill's sponsor. If the seven-day requirement for the expedited titles is removed from the bill, we can remove our fiscal note. We are short-handed in our Titles department, and we are having a tough time keeping up. Right now, it is taking about eight days for expedited titles. Our fear is that this would get out of control with the increased demand. We are fine with the rest of the bill because it aligns with our current processes.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] We will move to testimony in support for A.B. 290 (R1). Is there anyone who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there any testimony in opposition? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in the neutral position? [There was none.] Are there any closing remarks? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on this bill and open the work session. With all the fiscal notes removed from the bill with the amendment, I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 290 (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 present the floor statement on this bill. I will open the hearing on the next bill.

Assembly Bill 332 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to student education loans. (BDR 55-162)

Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24:

I represent Assembly District 24, which includes the University of Nevada, Reno. This bill is the student loan bill of rights. We heard this last session. Assemblyman Watts brought this bill last session. We put a bit more work into it. Today, Amanda Vaskov, a student, was intending to present this bill. She had to go back home and is not able to meet this evening. However, I am standing in as not the exact expert but as the second best.

Assembly Bill 332 (1st Reprint) does three things that provide consumer protections for student loan borrowers and their cosigners. These protections already exist for several other types of loans in Nevada. The bill establishes procedures for the licensure of education loan servicers in Nevada. We already have licensed mortgage loan servicers, but not education loan servicers. The bill holds student lenders and servicers accountable for engaging in predatory practices. The state entered a lawsuit with the loan servicer, Navient, and proved these practices were predatory and returned thousands of dollars in relief back to Nevadans. This is a known issue.

With the first reprint, the fiscal note from the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation was removed. The fiscal note from the Division of Financial Institutions, Department of Business and Industry is reflective of the start-up costs for the bill. The agency will pull from its reserves to cover these costs. I have sent an email to staff with this confirmation from the Division of Financial Institutions. As a result, the fiscal note from the Division of Financial Institutions will not be a State General Fund appropriation. All other fiscal notes are zero. I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

One moment, we are checking the email. I did not have the email, but it is online. The Division of Financial Institutions would be able to absorb the costs—is that your understanding?

Assemblywoman Peters:

Correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions for the presenter?

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I thought there was an amendment to remove the licensing part for these financial institutions.

Assemblywoman Peters:

There were discussions with one stakeholder who offered to send us some language. They never followed through with sending that language. We have no amendment to offer today.

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. 332 (R1)?

Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association:

We are speaking in support of A.B. 332 (R1).

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

We would like to thank Assemblywoman Peters for bringing forth this bill and working so closely with our student government to help ensure that these protections are there for our students. We are in support.

Kent M. Ervin, Ph.D., State President, Nevada Faculty Alliance:

We support college affordability, but student loans, unfortunately, have become a big part of the problems around that. We support the bill and thank Amanda Vaskov who worked so hard on this bill.

Shelby Port, Battle Born Progress:

In my personal class as a student borrower, I am currently staring down at \$70,000 in student loans. We are told that student loan debt is the only good debt. This is false, especially when bad actors are allowed to exploit students with abandon. I am not alone in this struggle. I know many of my peers are also facing gigantic amounts of student loan debt. Our student loan system is fundamentally broken, and no unsuspecting 18-year-old student should be forced to make a financial decision that can alter the course of their financial lives forever and be at the whims of predatory loan servicers.

Eric Jeng, Acting Executive Director, One API Nevada:

In the state and nationwide, Asian American students have the highest unmet financial needs when it comes to student loans. Research shows that average low-income Asian American students at a public four-year university need \$4,000 more than the average low-income students. This is a great bill. We want to thank the sponsor of the student loan bill of rights, which is something we have been advocating for, and we thank you for hearing it.

[Assemblywoman Backus assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Backus:

Is there any more testimony in support of A.B. 332 (R1)? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in opposition? [There was none.] Is there any testimony in the neutral position?

Amanda Vaskov, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am calling in support, and my following testimony will have to be resorted into support. I am a recent University of Nevada, Reno graduate and have represented The Associated Students of the University of Nevada with over 14,000 of our undergraduate members. In working with my peers to bring forth this legislation, it has become clear that encountering predatory servicing and lending practices is all too common for student loan borrowers. We also know that managing student loan debt is a top barrier to seeking employment for recent Nevada graduates. Given that the federal COVID-19 student loan payment pause is set to lift as soon as August, I fear for the day that thousands of student borrowers will not only have to begin payments that they have not had to make for three years, but also navigate working with predatory loan servicers for the first time. Now, more than ever, is the time to get this legislation on the books. Given that it comes at no cost to the State General Fund, I urge you to support this legislation.

Vice Chair Backus:

Thank you, Amanda, for all your work on this. We will move your testimony to support. Do we have anyone wishing to give testimony in the neutral position on A.B. 332 (R1)? [There was no one.] I would welcome the bill sponsor back to give the closing remarks. [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 332 (R1) and open the work session. I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 332 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I voted yes for this in the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor to get it out, but I understood that there was going to be an amendment about the licensing part. I will vote yes again today, reserving my right to change my vote, and looking forward to seeing that amendment come forward before we have the vote on the floor.

Vice Chair Backus:

We have a motion.

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

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno will present the floor statement on this bill.

[Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

If you are here for Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint), that hearing, unfortunately, is being moved until tomorrow. Members, we have more bills to hear and work session. Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint) will be heard tomorrow about 9 a.m. or 10 a.m., in that timeframe. Members, we still have work, and we have some more bills and some work sessions to do.

We will take a brief recess [at 8:11 p.m.].

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I am going to call this meeting back to order [at 9 p.m.] I will open a work session. We will start with Assembly Bill 45 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 45 (1st Reprint): Creates a program to repay the student education loans of certain providers of health care. (BDR 18-359)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 45 (1st Reprint) was heard on May 17, 2023. It creates the Student Loan Repayment for Providers of Health Care in Underserved Communities Program to repay student education loans of providers of health care including physicians, physician assistants, dentists, licensed nurses, emergency medical technicians, optometrists, audiologists, practitioners of respite care, podiatrists, psychiatrists, clinical professionals, counselors, perfusionists, pharmacists, pharmacy technicians, social workers, as well as midwives and doulas.

There was a fiscal impact related to this. The Office of the State Treasurer had submitted a fiscal note of \$63,188 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$80,650 in FY 2025. The bill also provides for \$5 million of transfers from the Abandoned Property Trust Account to fund the program each year. There has been some discussion about utilizing some of this funding to support the operating costs that were identified by the Office of the State Treasurer, in addition to reducing the amount from a \$5 million transfer each year to a \$2.5 million transfer. If the Committee wishes to entertain a motion, it would be an amend and do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions?

Assemblyman Hafen:

During the hearing, there was a conversation about amending Assembly Bill 248 into A.B. 45 (R1). Is that moving forward or is that not part of the amendment that was discussed? If you need clarification, I am happy to provide it. It related to matching federal dollars.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Mr. Jimenez, I invite you to the table. There was a question on the floor about whether A.B. 248 was to be amended. There was discussion during the hearing to amend it into this bill. It is a \$250,000 per year allocation that has a dollar-for-dollar federal match. Could that be part of the fund to amend into your bill?

Erik Jimenez, Chief Policy Deputy, Office of the State Treasurer:

Assemblyman Hafen brought up Assembly Bill 248, which contains funding for the Nevada Health Service Corps. That is the existing loan repayment program that has a more limited scope operated out of the School of Medicine and Public Health, University of Nevada, Reno. That is a \$250,000 appropriation in each year of the biennium that has a dollar-for-dollar match. Typically, this has been brought forward every single session, and they fight for the match. If we were to amend that into this bill, it would be banked into the unclaimed property transfer, and we would never have to solve that problem again, much like we have the grant matching funds out of that unclaimed property transfer. We would be amenable to the change.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for getting that on the record.

Sarah Coffman:

With further clarification and conversation from the Committee, it appears that the amendment would then be to provide \$2.5 million in transfers from the Abandoned Property Trust Account to fund this program that is provided for in A.B. 45 (R1) that is also funding to pay for the fiscal impact that the Office of the State Treasurer indicated that they would need to fund the program, and in addition, \$250,000 from the Abandoned Property Trust Account would also be incorporated to provide an allocation to the Nevada Health Service Corps for \$250,000 per year for a total of \$2.75 million.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 45 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 139 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 139 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing certain demographic information collected by governmental agencies. (BDR 19-122)

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 139 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing certain demographic information collected by governmental agencies. This bill was heard yesterday and presented by Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Assembly District No. 5. Assembly Bill 139 (1st Reprint) requires governmental agencies that collect demographic information on race or ethnicity to include a separate category for persons of Middle Eastern or North African descent.

Assemblywoman Miller presented a conceptual amendment during the bill hearing to clarify that the bill included language to allow justice-related entities including law enforcement, courts, and corrections that collect demographic information on race or ethnicity to include a separate category for persons of Middle Eastern or North African descent. With the proposed amendment, there was confirmation from the Department of Public Safety that their fiscal impact had been removed. The fiscal impact for the Administrative Office of the Courts, Nevada Supreme Court had also been removed.

There were a couple of other fiscal notes submitted that still apply including a fiscal note from the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation for \$2,083 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 that is in a budget account that is funded with federal funds. The Committee would not need to provide an appropriation to address that fiscal impact. There was also a fiscal note from the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services for \$15,000 per year. That is in the Women, Infants and Children's budget. Again, that budget is funded with federal funds and other funds, so that would not need to be addressed with an appropriation. There was a fiscal note for the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange. They testified during the hearing that they can absorb the fiscal impact.

The one fiscal impact that remains is for the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services. During the hearing, it was confirmed that their fiscal impact was reduced to \$140,400 for FY 2024 and would require a State General Fund appropriation. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the amendment could provide a General Fund appropriation for the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, to amend the bill to include the proposed amendment presented by Assemblywoman Miller. The motion would be to amend and do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, you have heard the explanation for the work session, and I would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 139 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will open the work session on
Assembly Bill 158.

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

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 158 was heard by the Committee on May 26, 2023. It ratifies the Recognition of Emergency Medical Services Personnel Licensure Interstate Compact. The Compact authorizes emergency medical services personnel who are certified in Nevada to practice pursuant to that certification in any other state that has ratified the Compact, while also authorizing emergency medical personnel who are certified in another state that has ratified the Compact to practice pursuant to the certification in this state.

Regarding the fiscal impact, the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services identified \$10,000, primarily as the cost to support the annual maintenance fee to connect to the Compact's coordinated database. If the Committee wishes to approve this 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 158.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will open the work session on
Assembly Bill 160 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 160 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the sealing of certain criminal records. (BDR 14-634)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 160 (1st Reprint) provides a process for the automatic sealing of eligible criminal records. This bill requires the Records, Communications and Compliance Division, Department of Public Safety to develop and implement a process to identify each eligible conviction and eligible charge to be sealed and each criminal justice or other custodian of records that may have possession of the records. Each month, the Division must transmit a list of eligible convictions and charges to the Administrative Office of the Courts, Supreme Court recommending the sealing of the associated records.

There was a proposed amendment for this bill that moves the implementation dates up and limits the categories to category E felonies and drug offenses only. There is a fiscal impact that was provided by the Department of Public Safety. The sponsor of the bill would like to amend the bill to add \$1.5 million to cover the fiscal costs as well as costs related to the Advisory Task Force on Automatic Record Sealing. In addition, the sponsor of the bill would also like to provide \$1 million to the Interim Finance Committee for a statewide vendor contract associated with this. If the Committee wishes to adopt the amendment and the suggested changes that are provided by the sponsor, then the motion would be amend and 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 AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 160 (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.)

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 279 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 279 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the waiver of tuition and registration and certain fees for students who are children of certain veterans. (BDR 34-531)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 279 (1st Reprint) prohibits the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada from assessing tuition charges against a child of a veteran who has been awarded the Purple

Heart and requires the Board of Regents to waive the payment of registration fees, laboratory fees, and any other mandatory fees assessed each semester against a student who is a child of a veteran of the armed forces of the United States who has been awarded the Purple Heart to the extent that fees exceed the amount of federal education benefit for which the student is entitled.

The bill, as amended, provides the age of a child eligible to receive such waivers. The Nevada System of Higher Education could not determine what the fiscal impact would be, although it would be a reduction in tuition revenues. There has been some discussion of a potential amendment to this bill that would limit the participants to those who are Nevada residents who are Purple Heart recipients and for the students who have graduated or attended high school in Nevada. If the Committee wishes to approve this bill, the motion would be amend and 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 AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 279 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will open the work session on Assembly Bill 346.

Assembly Bill 346: Revises the State Budget Act. (BDR 31-928)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 346 was heard by the Committee on May 23, 2023. It provides a definition for the adjusted base budget calculation. Currently, there is no definition related to how the adjusted base budget is calculated. There is an established practice whereby the adjusted base budget includes the actual expenditures and revenues for the last completed even-numbered year plus or minus routine adjustments related to one-time expenditures.

Assembly Bill 346 provides a definition in section 1, subsection 5 for the adjusted base budget to mean an amount appropriated to the agency by the Legislature for the second year of the current biennium, adjusted for the removal of one-time appropriations or authorizations, adjusted for statewide fringe benefits, contractual obligations, ongoing expenditures approved by the Interim Finance Committee, annualization of costs incurred in part of the second year, actual caseload, rate changes, and any other adjustments that may be necessary as determined by the Director of the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor.

There is a fiscal note on this bill from the Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau. We reached out to the vendor of our budgeting software system and asked them whether our system would be able to meet the changes related to this legislation. They indicated to us that they would need about 120 hours of programming at \$225 per hour, which would result in a fiscal impact of \$27,000.

There was a mock-up amendment that provided a bit of cleanup language related to both appropriations and authorizations that are utilized in the definitions. If the Committee wishes to move this bill, the motion would be to amend and do pass to include the fiscal note as well as the mock-up amendment that has been provided.

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 346.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will present the floor statement on this bill. The last item on our work session agenda for tonight before we go to the floor is Assembly Bill 518.

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

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 518 establishes a formula for determining the maximum amount a county may be required to pay for the provision of indigent defense services. Additionally, the bill prohibits a county from seeking reimbursements from the state for the cost of capital improvement projects related to the provision of indigent defense services. The bill also establishes requirements for the counties to submit annual financial status reports to the Department of Indigent Defense Services unless the Department requires such reporting quarterly.

Section 7 of the bill makes State General Fund appropriations of \$6.3 million in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$6.6 million in FY 2025 to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) for the allocation to the Department of Indigent Defense Services to fund the reimbursement of counties for the cost in excess of the maximum contribution amounts for the proposed indigent defense service costs for the Department related to compliance with the *Davis v. State* Stipulated Consent Judgment; costs of the Office of the State Public Defender for contracts for legal services for complex cases; costs for training and pay parity for the attorneys; and to provide indigent defense services.

There were two proposals that were discussed during the hearing. The first was provided by the Department of Indigent Defense Services that proposed various changes including amending section 2 of the bill to clarify how each county's maximum contribution amount is calculated; setting the base year as the actual cost to the county for providing indigent defense services for FY 2021 and FY 2022, less any state reimbursements; and to ensure the maximum contribution amount for each county is adjusted annually on a compounding basis by the lesser of the cost of inflation for the immediately preceding calendar year or 5 percent. In addition, the amendment would add a new subsection to section 2 clarifying that the counties are not required to seek state reimbursements for indigent defense costs more than maximum contribution amounts.

The proposed amendment also includes a new section of the bill which would add State General Fund appropriations to the budget of the Office of the State Public Defender and the Department of Indigent Defense Services. These include appropriations of \$575,000 in each fiscal year of the biennium. However, I do not believe that was being contemplated by the Committee. The amendment would also require the Department of Indigent Defense Services to submit annual reports to the IFC detailing the expenditures made from the appropriations included in section 7. Lastly, the amendment would revise the effective date from July 1st to upon passage and approval.

I would also note that there was a second amendment that was provided by Mary Walker requesting an annual ongoing appropriation of \$1,474,200 to support overtime and weekend work based on the number of judges and attorneys and how many times they hold court over the weekend. Funding would also be restricted to certain purposes, and unused funds would be required to revert.

There was also one more amendment that was submitted to us today, and I believe Assemblyman Yeager may want to address that one as well.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Ms. Walker, would you come up to the table please and explain the amendment?

Mary Walker, representing Douglas County; Lyon County; and Storey County:

I worked with the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor as well as with the Department of Indigent Defense Services. What we were originally thinking when we were on the Senate side is to have the Office of the State Controller pay a lump sum amount to the counties. You can calculate it. We know how many times counties hold court on the weekends. We know how many people are involved, and it is a flat dollar amount. It is going to be a payment to them by August 1st of each year. In talking with the Office of Finance as well as the Department of Indigent Defense Services, we thought a more permanent structure would be to fund it through the Department of Indigent Defense Services. That is why we have that amendment for you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, is that clear? Does everyone understand what this last amendment will be on this bill? Yes.

Sarah Coffman:

In reviewing the most recent amendment, there were some things that Fiscal staff identified that I would like to get on record for consideration by the Committee. Section 7.3 for the appropriation for the weekend stipend clause indicates any remaining funding shall be reimbursed back to the Office of the State Controller. This should be updated as the funding will no longer be placed into a new account under the Office of the State Controller and instead would go straight to the Department of Indigent Defense Services budget. I would suggest replacing it with the standard reversion language indicating unspent funds would revert to the General Fund. In addition, under section 7.3, I am under the impression that the appropriation included would be ongoing beyond the 2023-2025 biennium. The Committee may wish to consider identifying this as a one-time appropriation, and if the agency wishes to continue this in their budget, they should seek this as an enhancement unit within their budget in future biennia. That concludes the remarks that we have regarding this measure.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions?

Assemblyman Hafen:

I believe that the approximately \$6 million a year that was going to the Department of Indigent Defense Services was going to have to come before the IFC for approval. Is that still part of the amendment? I want to make sure that I am understanding correctly that portion.

Sarah Coffman:

I believe that this would incorporate all three amendments except for a portion of the first amendment that was prepared by the Department of Indigent Defense Services that requested \$577,095 in each year of the 2023-2025 biennium related to the Office of the State Public Defender to fund contract costs of indigent defense attorneys. I do not believe that was something that the Committee indicated they wish to pursue. It would still be everything within the first proposed amendment, Mary Walker's second amendment, as well as Mary Walker's third amendment, with the provision that I provided as technical changes by Fiscal staff.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I do not have a question but a comment. I want to thank the individuals who worked on this amendment. I think the creation of the Department of Indigent Defense Services and the state obligation to fund public defense has certainly been a work in progress. As many of

you on IFC know, I particularly like that there is a fund to compensate for the courts that must take place on weekends and in the rural areas to comply with a 48-hour requirement. As stated, we cannot commit to funding that long term. I think it has to be a budget enhancement decision unit for the Department of Indigent Defense Services, but it would encourage individuals who feel the effect of that to be able to make sure that it gets reported back to the Legislature in terms of what that is able to do, in terms of processing those cases, and in terms of morale and finding people who are willing to do it because it is important constitutionally. I think if we can get that information back, whatever the next iteration of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means and Senate Committee on Finance is, I think we will be able to look at that and put some consideration into whether that is going to be a long-term solution to this problem.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, we have a clarification of exactly where the money is going to land in response to Assemblyman Hafen's question.

Sarah Coffman:

The \$6.3 million in FY 2024 and the \$6.6 million in FY 2025 would go to the IFC Contingency Account. Section 9 provides the \$1.4 million that would be for the weekend stipends. That would go to the Department of Indigent Defense Services directly.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 518.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We still have more work to do on the floor, and we might come back, so we are going to recess this meeting. We will stand in recess [at 9:39 p.m.].

[The Committee reconvened behind the bar of the Assembly at 11:11 p.m.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will call this meeting back to order. We will open a work session on Assembly Bill 400.

Assembly Bill 400: Revises various provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-1088)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 400 is an act relating to education; creating the Early Childhood Literacy and Readiness Account and authorizing grants from the Account for certain purposes; revising various provisions relating to the Commission on School Funding; authorizing, under certain circumstances, the State Public Charter School Authority to award money to a charter school for the transportation of pupils; authorizing a city or county to sponsor a charter school; requiring a city or county that sponsors a charter school to annually report certain information; revising provisions relating to the Teach Nevada Scholarship Program; creating the Nevada Teacher Advancement Scholarship Program; revising provisions governing the promotion of pupils; revising provisions relating to the retention of pupils in the same grade; making appropriations; and providing various other matters.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Assemblyman Yeager, would you like to discuss the amendment?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I will highlight the various changes in the amendment. The fiscal changes are contained in Amendment No. 884 in section 93.5 as follows: There is hereby appropriated from the State General Fund to the Early Childhood Literacy and Readiness Account created by section 12 of this act the following sums: for the Fiscal Year 2023-2024, \$70,000,000; for the Fiscal Year 2024-2025, \$70,000,000.

Any balance of the sums appropriated by subsection 1 remaining at the end of the respective fiscal years must not be committed for expenditure after June 30 of the respective fiscal years by the entity to which the appropriation is made or any entity to which money from the appropriation is granted or otherwise transferred in any manner, and any portion of the appropriated money remaining must not be spent for any purpose after September 20, 2024, and September 19, 2025, respectively, by either the entity to which the money was appropriated or the entity to which the money was subsequently granted or transferred, and must be reverted to the State General Fund on or before September 20, 2024, and September 19, 2025, respectively.

There is hereby appropriated from the State General Fund to the Nevada Teacher Advancement Scholarship Program Account created by section 62 of this act the following sums: for the Fiscal Year 2023-2024, \$2,000,000; for the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 \$2,000,000.

Any balance of the sums appropriated by subsection 1 remaining at the end of the respective fiscal years must not be committed for expenditure after June 30 of the respective fiscal years by the entity to which the appropriation is made or any entity to which money from the appropriation is granted or otherwise transferred in any manner, and any portion of the appropriated money remaining must not be spent for any purpose after September 20, 2024, and September 19, 2025, respectively, by either the entity to which the money was

appropriated or the entity to which the money was subsequently granted or transferred, and must be reverted to the State General Fund on or before September 20, 2024, and September 19, 2025, respectively.

There are several other changes contained in Amendment 884 that you have before you.

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 400.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will present the floor statement on this bill. We will recess this meeting [at 11:16 p.m.]

[The meeting was adjourned on the floor at 11:30 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Janice Wright
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 119 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Assemblyman David Orentlicher, Assembly District No. 20.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 138](#), presented by Jeanette K. Belz, representing Shatterproof.

[Exhibit E](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 519](#), presented by Ken Higbee, Director of Special Services, Elko County School District.

[Exhibit F](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 266 \(1st Reprint\)](#), dated May 30, 2023, submitted by Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County.

[Exhibit G](#) is a mock-up proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 323 \(1st Reprint\)](#), dated May 24, 2023, presented by Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3.

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter dated May 31, 2023, submitted by Deanna Hua Tran, Coalition Coordinator, Nevada Immigrant Coalition, in support of [Assembly Bill 323 \(1st Reprint\)](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 301 \(1st Reprint\)](#), dated May 30, 2023, submitted by Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County, on behalf of Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts, Assembly District No. 13.

[Exhibit J](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 322 \(1st Reprint\)](#), dated May 1, 2023, submitted by Assemblyman Duy Nguyen, Assembly District No. 8.

[Exhibit K](#) is a fiscal note dated May 26, 2023, submitted by Teresa Hayes, Environmental Health Program Manager, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services, regarding [Assembly Bill 322 \(1st Reprint\)](#).

[Exhibit L](#) is a letter dated May 31, 2023, submitted by Deborah Earl, Vice President, Power2Parent, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 357](#).

[Exhibit M](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 249 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Sheila Bray, Community Partnerships Coordinator for Clark County, Extension, University of Nevada, Reno.

[Exhibit N](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 290](#) dated May 17, 2023, presented by Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May, Assembly District No. 42.