

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

**Eighty-Second Session
June 1, 2023**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 9:19 a.m. on Thursday, June 1, 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:

Assemblywoman Venicia Considine, Assembly District No. 18
Assemblywoman Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16
Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6

Minutes ID: 1325



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Thomas J. Burns, Executive Director, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor
Stacey Bostwick, Director, Workforce Development, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor
Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Andrew Clinger, Chief Financial Officer, Nevada System of Higher Education
Constance J. Brooks, Vice President, Office of Government and Community Engagement, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Michael Sullivan, representing College of Southern Nevada
Serena Kasama, representing Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
Mendy K. Elliott, representing Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada; PBS Reno; Nevada Humane Society, Reno; and Nevada Housing Coalition
Robert Potts, Deputy Director, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor
Nick Vander Poel, representing Northern Nevada Development Authority
Dylan Keith, Assistant Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Sarah Adler, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada; and Principal, Silver State Government Relations
Amber Stidham, representing Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
Zach Conine, State Treasurer
Kanani Espinoza, representing Junior League of Las Vegas; Nevada HAND Inc.; and Jobs for Nevada Graduates
William Horne, Vice President, Nevada, Strategies 360
Miles Dickson, representing Nevada GrantLab
Helen Foley, representing FirstMed Health and Wellness
Lesley Pittman, representing Domestic Violence Resource Center; and Waterford UPSTART
Mark Fiorentino, representing Renown Health
Kierra Capurro, representing Nevada Museum of Art; Nevada Blind Children's Foundation; and Northern Nevada HOPES
Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach, and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Janet Quintero, representing United Way of Southern Nevada
Zoë Houghton, representing The Children's Cabinet; and United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra

Marco Rauda, representing Green Our Planet; and United Way of Southern Nevada
Francisco Morales, Policy Advisor, Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck
Maggie Carlton, Executive Director, United Labor Agency of Nevada
Holly Welborn, Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance of Nevada
Amber Giroux, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition
Torrey A. Russell, Founder, Broadway in the H.O.O.D.
Benjamin Challinor, Director, Public Policy, Alzheimer's Association
Stacie Weeks, Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy,
Department of Health and Human Services
Ellen Crecelius, Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division,
Department of Health and Human Services
Kelly Cantrelle, Deputy Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services,
Department of Health and Human Services
Andrew LePeilbet, representing United Veterans Legislative Council
Shelbie Swartz, representing Battle Born Progress
Constance McMullen, representing Personal Care Association of Nevada
Lilith Baran, Policy Manager, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Kirk Widmar, Chief, Offender Management Division, Department of Corrections
Katie Brandon, representing Return Strong
Annette Magnus, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress
Erica Roth, Government Affairs Liaison, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County
Public Defender's Office
Caroline Mello Roberson, Southwest Regional Director, NARAL Pro-Choice
America
Lindsey Harmon, Executive Director, Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada
Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Yesenia Moya, Private Citizen
Debbie Springer, Executive Vice President, Public Sector, SEIU Local 1107
Ashley Gaddis, Private Citizen
Jeri Burton, Co-Executive Director, Nevada Chapter, National Organization for
Women
Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices
Betty Guess, Volunteer and Activist, Return Strong
Courtney Jones, Private Citizen
Leslie Turner, Private Citizen
Karissa Loper Machado, Agency Manager for Child Care, Division of Welfare and
Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services
Charlie De La Paz, representing Moapa Valley rural community
Matthew Tuma, Deputy Director, Department of Administration
Aaron Ford II, representing Nevada Police Union
Amy Stephenson, Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor
Rudy Pamintuan, Chief of Staff, Office of the Lieutenant Governor
Jack Robb, Director, Department of Administration

Alison Netski, M.D., Professor, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health;
Vice Dean for Clinical Affairs, Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine,
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

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

Kelly Crompton, Government Affairs Manager, City of Las Vegas

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

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

Andy Matthews, State Controller

James Smack, Chief Deputy Controller, Office of the State Controller

Tony Manfredi, Executive Director, Nevada Arts Council, Department of Tourism
and Cultural Affairs

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

Jennifer Roebuck, Deputy Executive Director, Compliance Division, Department of
Taxation

Connor Cain, representing Nevada Bankers Association

Brian Reeder, representing Nevada Credit Union League

Patrick J. Reynolds, Senior Tax Counsel, Council on State Taxation

Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada

Emily Osterberg, Director, Government Affairs, Henderson Chamber of Commerce

Joseph Bernardy, Deputy Executive Director, Information Technology, Department
of Taxation

James A. Settelmeyer, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural
Resources

Adam Sullivan, P.E., State Engineer and Administrator, Office of the State Engineer,
Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural
Resources

Tracy Bower, Director of External Affairs, Desert Research Institute

Brenda Scolari, Director, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs

Cheryl Tyler, Administrative Services Officer, Office of the Military

Gabriel DiChiara, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State

Michael K. Morton, Special Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney
General

Christopher Carter, Deputy Director, Peace Officers' Standards and Training
Commission

Sharath Chandra, Administrator, Real Estate Division, Department of Business and
Industry

Debi Reynolds, Deputy Director, Fiscal Services, Department of Health and Human
Services

Amber Law, Deputy Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy,
Department of Health and Human Services

Dena Schmidt, Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of
Health and Human Services

Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent, Student Investment Division, Department of Education

Cody L. Phinney, Deputy Administrator, Regulatory and Planning Services, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocols were explained.] We were not able to complete yesterday, and after being on the floor so late, I adjourned. We will be finishing those items from yesterday first. We will do a work session, then we will be starting on the Senate bills. We will be starting with Assembly Bill 483.

Assembly Bill 483: Makes an appropriation to the Workforce Innovations for a New Nevada Account. (BDR S-1145)

Thomas J. Burns, Executive Director, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor:

We are here to speak in support of Assembly Bill 483, and I would like to defer testimony to Stacey Bostwick, who is the Director of Workforce Development for the Office of Economic Development.

Stacey Bostwick, Director, Workforce Development, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor:

I did want to share that Assembly Bill 483 is this session's only vehicle to provide State General Funds to the Office of Economic Development (GOED), Office of the Governor, Workforce Innovations for a New Nevada (WINN) Account. The WINN Account was created by the Legislature in 2015 and is authorized by *Nevada Revised Statutes* 231.151. The fund is the only Workforce Development asset that can make investments in the creation, customization, or expansion of workforce training programs. These funds are ultimately passed through GOED to eligible postsecondary workforce training providers that develop training pathways for Nevadans and a talent pipeline for Nevada businesses. Since 2016, GOED's Board and leadership has approved through the General Fund allocation by the Legislature, over \$13 million in project funding that shaped 23 new, not previously available, workforce training options with over 60 employer partners that over 2,000 Nevadans have accessed. These new programs afford Nevadans access to high-wage and high-skill jobs in the growing sectors that are targeted by GOED through our state plan. Those include advanced manufacturing, health care technology, mining, and logistics and operations.

Finally, funding provided in A.B. 483 will enable GOED to continue to partner with postsecondary education institutions to develop and expand training pathways for new family sustaining jobs and to support business needs for a talented workforce. Projections of the programs have been provided, but a few examples that we aim to support include investments in the lithium lifecycle and battery recycling workforce, expansion of data

science and data analytics programming, expanding advanced logistics pathways access statewide, developing access to medical technician training programs for rural and frontier students, and many more. Thank you for your time, and we welcome any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenters? [There were none.] I went back to look at what this legislative body has done the last two legislative sessions, and last legislative session was not wonderful because we were in a pandemic. The amount of the appropriation in the bill is substantially higher than what was received in prior years. I want to be consistent to what we have done in the past, and looking at what was the highest year, it is right around \$3 million in each year of the biennium. That is what I would suggest this Committee approve this session, which would be a total of \$6 million.

Thomas J. Burns:

If I may, Madam Chair—I know that Director Bostwick has some projects in the pipeline—I would like to let her advise you of those because I think they are assets to the citizens of our state. So again, if I could ask her to step in.

Stacey Bostwick:

Our projections in terms of justification for the funding had a specific allocation of \$17 million, withholding an additional \$3 million for potential projects that might be needed during the biennium because of the two-year timeline. Specifically, fully baked projects that are in the pipeline that we would like to fund in the first three months of the biennium are north of \$10 million.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, is there any discussion or questions?

Assemblywoman Backus:

With respect to those projects that you suggest are in the pipeline, can you elaborate exactly what those projects are?

Stacey Bostwick:

I do not have all of the projects, but I will do my best to recall them. I work with them on a daily basis. All of the projects that are set to come before our June Board meeting for approval for July 1, 2023—assuming that we get funding—are through the community colleges and Nevada State College. The projects include data science, manufacturing, battery recycling, logistics, welding expansion, and instrumentation in northern Nevada. It covers the breadth of all four community colleges along with Nevada State College.

Assemblywoman Backus:

I take it that the plan to take before your Board is to present grants to the various institutions that are going to provide these programs.

Stacey Bostwick:

That is correct. The Office of Economic Development is a pass-through. Our obvious role in this is to cultivate relationships with education and business to create these programs. At the end of the day, all of the funding goes to postsecondary institutions; the bulk of which have been public institutions within the Nevada System of Higher Education. We have provided funding in the private sector as well. We have a lot of flexibility in that funding, but we do pass through that funding to those institutions to develop these programs.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Looking at the funding that your Department has received for this fund is nowhere near \$20 million. Can you explain why you would request \$20 million for funding when the highest appropriations previously have been \$6 million?

Stacey Bostwick:

I would not be so bold as to say we could spend what we get because that is an exaggeration. We have done our best to facilitate the dollars with what funding we receive. The reality is the funding, at whatever level that was, provides a limitation on what we are able to do for projects. We only have two years to spend the dollars. It also takes projects and potentially a slice of a project. To your point, Chair Monroe-Moreno, we have had kind of a varying level of funding, and so we have to pivot based on our priorities. We have to respond to that level. We built projections that included \$17 million that we realistically felt would get spent within that two years. The reason there is that gap between \$17 million and \$20 million is being the Governor's Office of Economic Development, if a project bubbles up in the beginning of the biennium that we did not anticipate, we need to be able to respond to that and work with that business or businesses with an education partner to build a program. The \$17 million is our crystal ball, if you will. We know that those projects are needed, and we know there are business partners to support that. The \$3 million that is in addition to that \$17 million is a representation of our trying to be able to be responsive to business should that come up during the biennium.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 483?

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

The Vegas Chamber is in support of A.B. 483.

Andrew Clinger, Chief Financial Officer, Nevada System of Higher Education:

We are in full support of A.B. 483.

Constance J. Brooks, Vice President, Office of Government and Community Engagement, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

We are in full support of A.B. 483, and while we are not a direct recipient of these funds, we do appreciate how they are going to be expended among our community colleges, which are direct feeders to our institution as well as to our sister institution, Nevada State almost University.

Michael Sullivan, representing College of Southern Nevada:

We are in full support of this legislation.

Serena Kasama, representing Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance:

We urge your support as this bill would afford GOED the resources to deliver its mission more efficiently and flexibly, supporting workforce investment programs.

Mendy K. Elliott, representing Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada:

We are in full support, and thank you so much for hearing the bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 483? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] Are there any closing comments from the presenters?

Stacey Bostwick:

I have nothing additional to add. Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 483. The next item on our agenda is Assembly Bill 484.

Assembly Bill 484: Makes an appropriation to the Office of Economic Development in the Office of the Governor for the support of designated regional development authorities. (BDR S-1144)

Thomas J. Burns, Executive Director, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor:

Good morning again. With me today is Bob Potts, the Deputy Director, and I am going to ask Mr. Potts to provide testimony today.

Robert Potts, Deputy Director, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor:

Thank you for taking the time to hear this bill. Let me walk you through the merits of it. The Office of Economic Development (GOED) currently provides grants to support the activity of Nevada's eight regional development authorities. Unfortunately, support has continued to shrink over the last three years because of budgetary cutbacks as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although the state's economy has largely recovered, due in part to

the ongoing efforts of the regional development authorities, there have been no budget restorations. Those under-resourced efforts are not sustainable, especially in light of another pending downturn in the economy.

In recent years, the regional development authorities have played a critical role in recruiting new companies, supporting existing companies, and assisting startups. Additionally, they have played a key role in molding Nevada's workforce to support nascent and future high-tech industries and to help improve the business environment through policy planning and research. The Office of Economic Development's strategy in funding the regional development authorities allows local economic development efforts to recruit companies that are the best fit for their specific regions. Historically, Nevada's economic development recruitment was centralized, which is not the most effective strategy. A supply chain company servicing the mining industry is obviously a better fit in Elko than it would be in Reno or Las Vegas. Recruitment at the local level frees up GOED to be more effective in assisting regional development authorities in developing strategies and policies. Over the past three years, however, with the onset and impact of the pandemic on our economies, the regional development authorities have had to step up their efforts to include a much broader range of business workforce education and community development support. Specifically, they are called to play a much larger role in supporting housing, broadband, transportation, and entrepreneurial opportunities. This shift is largely a result of the accelerated structural change in our formative economy as the results of the pandemic.

Now more than ever, supporting the regional development authorities is necessary in ensuring the development of our state's economy and making sure that it stays on track. They are an essential and integral part of Nevada's economic development ecosystem, and providing adequate and additional resources for them at this critical juncture is necessary in support of GOED's mandate. The one-shot appropriation is also needed to address inflationary impacts and the ongoing staffing challenges that they, like all of us, have endured. Even if regional development authority funding is restored to prepandemic levels, those amounts will be inadequate going forward without the support of those one-shot dollars because of inflationary cost impacts and staffing shortages they, too, have experienced. Thank you for your time and consideration of this bill, and we are happy to address any questions you might have.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenters? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 484?

Nick Vander Poel, representing Northern Nevada Development Authority:

We are very appreciative and supportive of A.B. 484.

Dylan Keith, Assistant Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

We are in support as well. Thank you.

Mendy K. Elliott, representing Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada:

The Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada is a public-private partnership which was established in 1983. They cover Lyon, Washoe, and Storey Counties, and without the support of GOED and the funds from the state, our mission would be that much more difficult. We have been very successful in northern Nevada, and the northern Nevada legislators who are here can attest to that. We want to thank you for hearing the bill and certainly thank the state as well as GOED for all of their support of the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada. Thank you.

Sarah Adler, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

To share some historical context, 36 years ago in 1986, I was at the Commission on Economic Development, and I was helping to create the rural development authorities. This is a long-term effort. I am glad to share with you, 15 years ago I was very involved with the Lincoln County Development Authority in developing Pinyon Pine as potential biomass and having economic characteristics. Today, Lincoln County Regional Development Authority and the country of Denmark are investing together and developing that. Regional economic development is extremely important to rural Nevada as a long-term process, but it needs sustainable funding.

Amber Stidham, representing Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance:

For all the reasons mentioned earlier, we also urge your support.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 484? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 484 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 526. Good morning, Treasurer Conine and Speaker Yeager. I am so excited to have this discussion. This has taken a lot of work to get here, and I appreciate you both.

**Assembly Bill 526: Revises provisions relating to state financial administration.
(BDR S-1205)**

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9:

We are affectionately calling Assembly Bill 526 the "pie bill," and I will tell you about that in a moment. This bill seeks to do a couple of really important things. I do not think it is a surprise to anybody on this Committee that the state of Nevada is not doing a very good job spending COVID-19 relief money. We are doing a good job allocating it, and through the work of the Interim Finance Committee, we have allocated most of what we have. But the fact is—it is not being spent. There are a lot of reasons for that, and I am not here to criticize anybody, but it is not being spent. We are one of the worst states in the country right now at actually spending COVID-19 relief funds. The problem we are trying to address is avoiding the state of Nevada having to return a lot of money to the federal government because it has not been spent in the time frame required by federal legislation, which I believe is the end of 2026. This is why I have the State Treasurer here because he knows all this stuff way better than I do.

There are a couple of different deadlines we are up against. One is for the allocation or obligation of the funds—I believe that is at the end of 2024. Then there are two years to spend the funds. The concern is that we are going to get to the point where we are staring down the inability to spend the money, and we are going to have to give it back to the federal government. Keep in mind that money is Nevada's fair share. It is money that our taxpayers paid to the federal government and came to us during a time of immense challenge in the state, with thanks to our federal delegation who worked very hard to get every single dollar to us. That is the problem we are trying to address. No one wants to be in that situation.

So how do we solve that problem? What you have in front of you is a potential solution to this problem. There are a lot of different parts to this bill, but essentially in section 1, on or after July 15, 2024, but before August 2024—those dates are significant because there is reporting that is due at the end of each quarter to the federal government—the Governor would have to look at every work program, every dollar, every American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA) dollar that has been obligated or allocated, and make a determination of one of two things. Either we are going to be able to spend this money by the end of 2026, or we are not going to be able to spend this money by the end of 2026. What happens then is—if the election is we are going to spend it—the money stays where it is for its stated purpose. If the election is—we are not going to be able to spend it—it gets pulled back from where it is now. We talk a lot in this Committee about waterfalls, and so there was an idea where we pull it all back and maybe we have a waterfall allocation where some of it would go to this purpose, and once we exhaust this, it goes to the next purpose. We thought maybe we would have a different concept that instead of a waterfall, we would have a pie. The truth is, if you are in a waterfall, you might be at the bottom of that waterfall, and you might never see any water. If we are able to do a concept that looks like a pie, everybody gets a slice. No matter how much money there is, you get a slice according to a percentage.

The rest of the part that you see in the bill lists 369 nonprofits in our state starting on page 4. These are nonprofits that are doing some really important and critical work in our state. This list tells you how every dollar would be divvied up. We do not know right now how much money that could be. We might get to July of next year and the Governor might say, I am confident we can spend all of the money by the end of 2026. If that happens, we have a pie, but we have no ingredients and the ovens are not working. It was a nice concept of a bill, but nothing would happen. But if the amount ends up being \$1 million, \$5 million, \$10 million, or \$500 million, that all comes back to the pie, and it gets distributed to these nonprofits as direct recipients of COVID-19 relief funds. They can receive the money in that way. In constructing the pie and looking at the ingredients with the State Treasurer, we try to think about what are the most important things in our state? Where are the needs? We know what the needs are. We sit through budget hearings every day in this Committee, but I will just take you through some of the broader categories.

The way to look at this is there are slices to the pie, big slices, and then within that pie, we have smaller bites for smaller pieces. If you go with me to page 4, that is where the list starts. What we see there is number 1—services—so services would be a slice of the pie. If you look over to the right, that slice of the pie would get 8 percent of all of the money

brought back in on the state of election. Within the services category we have smaller slices or bites. You see underneath Services, the heading of Children, which are nonprofits that focus on children. If you look at that first one, the Boys and Girls Club of Truckee Meadows, the way this works is whatever that 8 percent is, whatever that number is, the Boys and Girls Club of Truckee Meadows would get 19 percent of that 8 percent. Go down the list and you see each individual nonprofit has a percentage assigned. That is the first one, Services, and under that heading, Children. On page 6, we have another bite under the Services category, and that would be Disability, with some nonprofits listed. On page 7, the third bite of the Services slice is Domestic Violence. On page 8, the fourth bite would be Legal, and on page 9, the fifth bite would be Seniors. At the bottom of page 9, the final bite in the Services category would be Miscellaneous Services we had a hard time putting into another category.

Obviously, there are going to be a lot of nonprofits here. You recognize the names of them—you know what they do. There will be some smaller ones that you are not as familiar with. Working through the different slices on page 11, we have Health Care within the Health Care slice, we have Addiction or Mental health, we have Hospitals or Clinics, we have Dental Care, we have Veterans, we have Miscellaneous Health Care. The third slice is Housing. We know how important housing is, and at the bottom of page 16, Housing will get 11 percent of the allocation.

Page 18 refers to Community Hubs; I think you will see a lot of nonprofits there. You will recognize on page 19, the fifth slice is Food Assistance, which probably has never been more critical given the federal changes that have happened with the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and the fact that untold numbers of Nevadans are having their benefits cut drastically. On page 20 we get to the sixth slice which is Job Training. On page 22, the seventh slice is Arts and Culture; and on page 25, the eighth slice is Animal Care, and I think that is it.

Here is sort of how things will work: we have the list, we have the nonprofits, we have the percentages, and we have the election that will be made by the Governor's Office. Between now and then, the Office of the State Treasurer will assist, and we are going to provide in the bill a \$250,000 allocation for the Treasurer's Office to seek some assistance. They are going to make sure every one of these nonprofits listed has attested to the fact that they can be direct beneficiaries of COVID-19 relief money. Generally, they can do that by indicating that they were a functioning nonprofit at the time of COVID-19 and that they suffered some sort of loss from COVID-19 including that we did not have as many volunteers, we were not able to raise money, and we will get them preregistered so that they are vendors of the state. The idea here is that we have a pie that is going to be self-sliced and self-delivered to these nonprofits.

If, for instance, a nonprofit says that it is not really interested in going through this process, or it finds in the registration process that it does not qualify, their portion of the allocation gets reallocated within their slice on a pro rata basis. If we had an unlikely scenario where no nonprofit in that slice qualified, then the slice would be reallocated pro rata. This really is

a self-executing math problem and with a recognition to our Legal staff that we asked them to do a lot of interesting things in this building. I think this was one of the more interesting things we have asked them to do, and they were able to get this up and down very quickly.

I think that is probably all I am going to say about this bill, but I will hand it over to the State Treasurer who has been instrumental in helping with this concept and helping with this list.

Zach Conine, State Treasurer:

I would like to echo Assemblyman Yeager's comments. Our gratitude to the Legal Division and the Fiscal Analysis Division and everyone else for putting this together as quickly as they did. My gratitude to the Speaker, and you, Madam Chair, for buying into the pie metaphor. I did not know if that was going to land, so I appreciate that. I will talk briefly about eligibility and then a little about how the list came together. From the eligibility perspective, within the final rule for the state and local fiscal relief funds given to the state by ARPA, it allows 501(c)(3) organizations and other nonprofits to be direct beneficiaries. That is important because most of the money to date that is going out the door to nonprofits has been as subgrantees. They had to come through the community redevelopment or community grants that were given out—that \$30 million that came with a plan—and here is the plan and then there is reporting that happens after that. As we have seen, that money has been a little slower getting out the door than we would like. I think it is important to mention here how important nonprofits have been, not just during the pandemic but generally to Nevada. We are a state where a lot of the service work is handled at the local government and nonprofit levels. There are some states where the state is responsible for making sure that individuals have access to food, that mental health services are provided, that domestic violence victims have a place to go. In Nevada, a lot of that work gets handled by our nonprofits, and during the pandemic, as the Speaker mentioned, they all had trouble finding volunteers, they all had trouble raising money, and they all had additional need for services.

Because of that, in the federal Treasury's final rule for the state and local fiscal relief funds, they are allowed to be beneficiaries. By being beneficiaries, the state is making sure that they are eligible as beneficiaries, but it is not subgranting the money, which means that we do not have to go through a process on the back end of ascertaining how they use the money. The assumption is that they have already been injured, and we are solving and curing that injury as opposed to new work that is going out. We hope that removes some of the bureaucracy that unfortunately has kept some of those dollars from getting out the door to date.

We started with a list of 620 nonprofits in the state of Nevada. Those were culled from a screen that looked at every nonprofit that had filed a tax return in 2019, or more recently reported at least \$1 in revenue or expense and reported one employee or more. There are many nonprofits in Nevada, but the goal of that first screen was to take out entities that were pass-through entities that did not actually reside in the state of Nevada or entities such as parents who had a soccer team and they wanted to buy T-shirts for that soccer team without paying sales tax, so they filed a nonprofit but it was not an ongoing business. That list also

looked at entities that were Nevada chartered. There are some nonprofits that do very important work in the state that are not based in Nevada. Under our read of the state and local fiscal relief funds, and just to make sure that we were doing the work for Nevada-based organizations with employees here in Nevada, those were removed from the list.

We then looked through that list of 620 and tried to focus on the 369 that ended up on the final list with organizations that had a direct relationship to COVID-19 and either saw an increased need for services or a decreased amount of revenue. A few groups that were pulled out of the list were private schools, sporting clubs, and duplicates. There are some nonprofits that have multiple nonprofit LLCs and we combined them into one, or intended to. There are some churches that were part of the group that were pulled out—not service organizations sponsored by churches—but the literal church. Then there were organizations that did not have a pandemic correlation; that is not to say that the work those organizations do is unimportant, but we wanted to make sure that our efforts were focused.

The work that we would do from here, if this bill proceeds, is ensure that all of those nonprofits are registered as vendors. As anyone who has ever dealt with an agency that has gotten an appropriation from the state knows, going through that vendor process can take some time. Our goal is to make sure that whatever dollars come back into the pie can get out the door by December 2024. There are two important things to mention; while December of 2024 is the obligation date under the state and local fiscal relief funds and 2026 is the spend date, what they really mean is they have been allocated to a building and that building is in the process of getting built between 2024 and 2026—not, we have a plan to somehow spend these in the deliverance of services. That is why when you look at studies that say how much money is actually going out the door, Nevada is actually 49th out of 50 states. We know we are not 49th on need, and so our goal here is to make sure that all of this money goes out, because that was its original purpose. We are happy to take any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

There has been a lot of work that has gone into this. I appreciate the work that you and the Assembly leadership team has done, and those in the community who tirelessly picked up those phones in late-night hours. I know we have a few questions, and we are going to start with Assemblywoman Jauregui.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

I really want to thank you for the work that you put into this because I think this is huge. I think every single day there is a Nevadan who benefits from the work of a nonprofit. If this money is not spent, and I hope it gets spent in the way it is intended to be spent in the work that the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) did in allocating this money, because we took a lot of time to allocate this money to the areas where we thought there was need. But if it does not, I want to make sure that the money is still able to be used as it was intended, to help those Nevadans who through no fault of their own are struggling from COVID-19.

Do you have any projections about how much potentially could be clawed back? Can you give us an idea, if this bill does not pass, how much money Nevada could stand to lose?

Treasurer Conine:

It is difficult to know exactly. We certainly think it will be in the seven figures, and it will be in the millions, possibly in the tens of millions, or low hundreds of millions. These dollars sort of fall into three groups. There are dollars that were originally obligated—some of which are being reobligated—that were for the hiring of a person a year ago. That money will not be spent for that purpose, and unless it is reobligated, it is going to revert back to the state. There are dollars that we have spent in other purposes that could be eligible for state and local fiscal relief funds. The government will go through the process of making sure we are spending the more flexible money in the least flexible way, in that allocation process. There are going to be dollars where, as we have heard from some of the mental health services, our inability to hire and our inability to get those programs moving means that instead of 10 months, or 12 months, or 2 years of services being provided, there are only going to be 6 months. There are going to be some programs where the actual intention of the program does not work—we go out there and try to do it and we cannot. All of those are going to come back in. What we wanted to provide an opportunity for is programs where on that August 1st date, we know the money is going to be spent, but it has not gone out the door yet.

The Governor's team and the agencies that are closest to the work will be able to look at it and say, we can get this money out the door, or we do not feel comfortable, or the moment has already passed, and then let that get captured back in.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

You would be comfortable saying there is money that is going to be clawed back, so we need a mechanism, because if we do not have a mechanism, that money will not be spent. There is already money, personnel money, that did not get spent, so we need a clawback mechanism in order to reallocate the money.

Treasurer Conine:

It is not impossible—but it is improbable—that money will not need to be clawed back.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

I know there are some reporting requirements from the U.S. Treasury, so can you walk me through who is going to be doing the reporting? This is going to be reporting for all of these nonprofits, which is a big feat.

Treasurer Conine:

One of the beauties of this pie is we are able to designate nonprofits as beneficiaries. Therefore, when the money gets to that nonprofit, assuming they were eligible for it in the first place, that is the end of the reporting. The eligibility is the reporting. That allows us to not have this long tail of fees and work because we know, for a lot of small nonprofits, one of the big barriers to taking money from the state or federal government is the difficulty in reporting. We want to make sure that money gets spent. In this case, we can think about those nonprofits more as recipients of the Coronavirus housing assistance program, or PETS [Pandemic Emergency Technical Support] recipients, or Nevada TOTS [Transforming

Opportunities for Toddlers and Students] grant program recipients, where their eligibility is in their existence for the time. Once they are able to attest, and we will go through that process because that will be part of our reporting, they will not have additional reporting. We think that is a big piece of the beauty here because that removes a lot of that red tape and barriers for nonprofits to access these funds.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

I want to say thank you again for the work you put into this. I think so many Nevadans are going to benefit from this, and the nonprofits come in contact with our constituents more than we do sometimes.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

Thank you for this legislation. I think it is absolutely brilliant. I have worked nonprofit for 20 years, and by the way, I do not work for any of these organizations. I just want to let you know about that. I would like some clarification that there are no national organizations on here, and they are local Nevada nonprofits.

Treasurer Conine:

There are some organizations that have national involvement, such as the Boys and Girls Clubs, but the organizations of specific entities that are listed are Nevada-based businesses that have completed Nevada paperwork and have employees in the state.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

If there was an organization that is a national organization but they had a program that was specific for Nevada residents, and I am thinking of the mammovan, or something like that; is there a way that they could apply or is this list closed and that is it?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I am going to acknowledge if someone has a perfect piece of legislation in this building, I would love to see it. I think this is a reflection of the best that we could do in the moment. I do not think anyone was comfortable trying to come up with a concept that would potentially allow for additional allocations to organizations that we missed, because that probably happened. It did—it happened. We know that, and I have gotten emails about it. I do not think in the context of this bill that would happen, but I will say this: when we get to that point of the election that the Governor's Office makes, we claw back the money that cannot be spent. There is still the real possibility that some of the money that the Governor and staff say is going to be spent, will not be spent. It gets a little tricky because there are two different dates. There is the end of 2024, which is the obligation or allocation date, and there is the end of 2026, which is the spend date. I have a sense that there may be some additional money after the designation date that would not claw back under this bill, because this bill has a date and time, but would be available. Hopefully at that point, the Interim Finance Committee and the Governor's Finance Office would collaborate on what could and should be done with that money. I think that is a place where further conversation could

happen with folks that we missed. But in the interest of time and in the interest of making sure we put this money to good use, we think the bill has to move as is with apologies to those who are looking to be included. This bill did not exist before two days ago, so we hope folks see the value, and even if not perfect, this will certainly help folks on the ground.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

Thank you for that, and I appreciate all the work you did. There are so many nonprofits, and I think this list is amazing, and it has captured so many different nonprofits as well.

If I may have just one quick follow-up: could you talk briefly about how the percentages were decided?

Treasurer Conine:

For individual services, we looked at the connection to the pandemic, so food assistance and housing is higher. Within the individual slices, looking at the organizations, we looked at size of impact. We looked at that in a number of different ways; we started with a screen on number of employees and volunteers. That helped to size the organization. If there is one employee, the organization is generally smaller than others. We did a fair amount of research about how big they are, what their impact is, how they work with other organizations, and took a shot.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

I really think this is brilliant. It has been a little hard to keep up with national news over the last few days for some reason, but I read something about the debt ceiling deal and part of that is clawing back unspent COVID-19 funds. Do you know any details on that? Is it what is left over from the funds you are talking about here?

Treasurer Conine:

Our understanding of the debt ceiling compromise as currently exists is that it will claw back some dollars but will not touch the state and local relief dollars which have already been sent to the state. While we might be losing some opportunity in other programs, we do not expect that any of the dollars contemplated by this are going to get clawed back.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Before we go on, I would like to ask Mr. Leiser if he could give us an update of where we are with our unobligated dollars.

Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst:

You have heard me go over some of these numbers through the work session for the COVID-19 relief program budget and the budget closing. As was discussed during the budget closing and the work session, of the \$2.7 billion that the state had received based on funding that was spent to date, as well as what was approved through the interim by the IFC and funding that was recommended in the Governor's budget, there was approximately \$1 million left as unobligated funds.

However, through closing actions of the money committees, there were a number of programs that were identified to have savings. Those savings totaled just under \$34 million. In addition to that, there were a number of programs that the Legislature approved funding for that were not part of the Governor's recommended budget. Those totaled about \$7.6 million. In very rough numbers, there is approximately \$27 million in unobligated Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds at this time—call them rough general numbers. There were a number of positions that were funded with Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds that we have not fully reconciled yet in the ARPA statement and the ARPA sheets. I would note there is a bill that I believe moved out of Senate Finance within the last couple of days—Senate Bill 450—that would allocate \$25 million of Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds. If that bill were to move forward, that would leave just over \$2 million of unobligated funds. As was indicated by Assemblyman Yeager and Treasurer Conine, it certainly is reasonable to expect there is going to be additional savings from programs that have been approved. A number of those savings will be identified when fiscal year (FY) 2023 closes. That process typically happens around the September time frame, and we will have a better understanding of what those savings may be from FY 2023.

The other thing that I would put on the record that may be of interest for the Committee relating to the spend is to date, based on information in the state accounting system of what has gone out of the COVID-19 relief program budget, approximately \$600.8 million has been spent to date of the \$2.7 billion. That is just under 25 percent of the funding, and that breaks down to \$441.6 million spent in FY 2022 and about \$159.2 million spent in FY 2023 to date. I would also note that of the \$441.6 million that was spent in FY 2022, \$332.4 million of that was to replenish the unemployment compensation fund. Over half of what has been spent today was to replenish that fund.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you, Mr. Leiser. I know at every one of the IFC meetings you give us an update, but not everyone in the room always attends our IFC meetings, so I just wanted to make sure people knew exactly where we are at right now with our COVID-19 dollars and why this piece of legislation is so important.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

Out of an abundance of caution, I want to first put on the record that my employer is in this bill. I look forward to following that up with Legal to ensure there is no potential conflict of interest as this moves forward. It is a remarkable piece of legislation that we are looking at right now. I am honored to serve in this legislative body as the chair of the newly formed Nonprofit Legislative Caucus. We are honored to have five or six members of this Assembly body who serve in the nonprofit sector and have devoted their careers in service to our community outside of our service as legislators, which I am sure you all know is quite a call to duty. The need and the urgency to ensure that we do not return dollars that rightfully belong to the service organizations, the nonprofits, the people doing the good hard work every day, is growing. Having experienced the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic firsthand and showing up to do service every day, I can tell you how much this is needed and

appreciated. On behalf of the Nonprofit Legislative Caucus, which is bicameral and bipartisan, the need and the urgency are real. I want to thank you for your hard work to preserve those dollars in support of our community.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

I have to echo so many of my colleagues' comments that this is just brilliant. Previously, we were trying to allocate individual numbers on a moving number and trying to reallocate. Coming up with the pie and the percentages has solved all those problems. I can see there is an incredible amount of work in here. Thank you so much. We all contribute our dollars that go to Washington, D.C., and any part that I can get back for the state of Nevada, I want to maximize. I have to put on the record that I am really glad to see that the highest percentage was allocated toward housing, which we know is a big problem. I appreciate the work of the Committee in recognizing that and allocating that much toward our housing needs. Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions or comments? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 526?

Kanani Espinoza, representing Junior League of Las Vegas; Nevada HAND Inc.; and Jobs for Nevada Graduates:

First, I would like to thank Chair Monroe-Moreno, Assemblyman Yeager, and the State Treasurer for this bill. When I read it yesterday, I was very excited. I am a member of the Junior League of Las Vegas, which is included in this bill. I immediately told the Board and they were very excited to speak in support. I am also here on behalf of Nevada HAND Inc. and Jobs for Nevada Graduates.

William Horne, Vice President, Nevada, Strategies 360:

I would like to thank Assemblyman Yeager and Treasurer Conine for the presentation on A.B. 526. We are here in support. Strategies 360 takes great pride in our commitment and dedication to our nonprofits that we represent, and we have been in many of your offices for our clients. Those that are happy about this bill are SafeNest, Goodwill of Southern Nevada, Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow, Nevada Donor Network, and WestCare of Nevada, Inc., just for starters. We are very thankful that this bill recognizes the hard work that nonprofits do in our state every day. The last few years have been very tough for them, and we appreciate your recognizing them with this bill and we urge your support.

Miles Dickson, representing Nevada GrantLab:

It is a pleasure to be here in support of this bill today. In every corner of our state, nonprofits are serving Nevadans. Nonprofits and their 46,000 employees are helping Nevadans meet basic needs and build a greater quality of life for themselves and their communities. In the last couple of years, our collective reliance on that sector has surged, and it came at a great cost to many organizations, as expenses soared, as they served others, and as revenue and volunteerism plummeted. This bill goes such a long way in helping remediate the harm that

sector has experienced in the last few years. It also guarantees that federal funds reached Nevada communities and families as allowed and as intended by the state and local fiscal recovery fund. Our thanks for taking a look and advancing this bill. Thank you.

Helen Foley, representing FirstMed Health and Wellness:

We thank everyone for this and thank all of them for including us in this list.

Lesley Pittman, representing Domestic Violence Resource Center:

As a board member of the Domestic Violence Resource Center, I want to express our appreciation for being included in this bill and being recognized because of the impacts that COVID-19 had. We saw increased demand for our services and facilities to provide shelter, so we very much appreciate being considered for some of this funding.

Mark Fiorentino, representing Renown Health:

We are also very grateful for the creative work that went into this bill and ask you to support it and pass it.

Sarah Adler, Principal, Silver State Government Relations:

We have several clients who are within this bill because nonprofits are my wheelhouse in particular, but I am also on the board of a potential recipient, Healthy Communities Coalition of Lyon County. We are all about addressing poverty, and that is the intent of ARPA funds. To speak to Assemblywoman Jauregui's point, there is a lot of reporting; there is a lot of compliance, as there should be. I think overall ARPA is going to be a capacity-building experience for nonprofits who try and reach that level of capacity to do that work. At Healthy Communities Coalition, we already have our contract signed, but we would be glad to expend any additional funds that might become available. Thank you.

Kierra Capurro, representing Nevada Museum of Art; Nevada Blind Children's Foundation; and Northern Nevada HOPES:

We are in full support and thank you to the sponsors as well as Erik Jimenez.

Mendy K. Elliott, representing PBS Reno; Nevada Humane Society, Reno; and Nevada Housing Coalition:

I have to tell you, this is an absolute brilliant piece of legislation, and the tapestry of good work that is going to come from this piece of legislation, touching all the lives in Nevada, is just brilliant. Everybody who touched this piece of legislation—this is incredible. I just want to thank you, and you are changing lives this next biennium. Thank you so much.

Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach, and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers:

Obviously, when times are tough in Nevada, the work of nonprofits picks up. Not to belabor it, but this is the best bill of the session. That might be some recency bias, but just great. Thank you so much.

Janet Quintero, representing United Way of Southern Nevada:

I just want to thank you all for this bill. I know a few of you have received a report where United Way of Southern Nevada has identified \$13.2 million in gaps for emergency services. We are so grateful to be part of this list. We are so grateful for all your hard work, and we look forward to putting this money to work for Nevada. Thank you.

Zoë Houghton, representing The Children's Cabinet; and United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra:

I have a quick ditto, and we are very grateful to be included in this bill. Thank you.

Marco Rauda, representing Green our Planet; and United Way of Southern Nevada:

I echo everything that my colleagues have said, and I appreciate all the work that has been put into this bill.

Francisco Morales, Policy Advisor, Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck:

I just want to echo what everybody has said, but also add that lots of nonprofits are here in support. I want to just quickly mention one you may not know of: the Immigrant Home Foundation. I was just talking to the CEO, and last year more than 13,000 community members went to their door seeking immigration help. They primarily deal with U visas, domestic violence, and T visas—a lot of very difficult cases. And while the work is often not visible—they are right in the heart of East Las Vegas—they do really great work. I want to echo the sentiments and appreciate all the work you have done for all the nonprofits, but specifically for those that are helping the most vulnerable. Thank you.

Maggie Carlton, Executive Director, United Labor Agency of Nevada:

In full disclosure, we are one of those nonprofits that are listed among those 369 in A.B. 526. I want to thank you, Madam Chair, and all of your staff, the Speaker, his staff, and the State Treasurer. This truly is a brilliant piece of legislation, and I want to thank the Speaker for the pie analogy. Being a former coffee shop waitress, I have served a lot of pie over my 40 years of taking care of folks. I really appreciate his wanting to bake this pie and slice it as fairly as they possibly could. A lot of us nonprofits did not realize that we would be considered essential during COVID-19, and we kept our doors open and we were there to help people when they were at their lowest. I really do appreciate looking at this bill, the fairness of it, not knowing what the exact number is, wanting to make sure that the dollars that are meant to help Nevadans stay in Nevada. So again, thank you very much for the opportunity to testify. I have tried to stay away as long as I possibly could. You are down to the last couple of days of session, and I showed up. But thank you very much for all of your hard work.

Holly Welborn, Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance of Nevada:

This is a wonderful bill. It is a very smart way to ensure that funds get spent and allocated where they are needed. I was slightly concerned yesterday when I glanced at the bill, and I read it very quickly, about what would happen to unallocated funds if a listed organization declined to apply. I am very happy to hear that if we decline to apply for the grant, the money will be reallocated to other entities within that particular category. We are one of the nonprofits listed in this bill. Thank you so much, but we cannot apply or accept

government funds as a matter of organizational policy. This prohibition ensures that we can effectively advocate without conflicts that could compromise our mission to serve as an independent advocacy voice for Nevada's children. I think there are other organizations on that list that might be in the same predicament. I just wanted to testify today in support and make the record very clear that if we declined to apply, that those funds will go toward the service providers who desperately need that funding. Thank you so much.

Amber Giroux, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a community member in Las Vegas, and I worked for and with multiple nonprofits. I want to thank the legislators for this bill, but just like the previous speaker was saying, I do think that there is some oversight in who is being included in this bill when some organizations cannot accept government funds. On that note, I do support the funds for domestic violence survivors and victims and to protect them more. I think that SafeNest and The Shade Tree are really holding people up a lot. I am sure there are others that I do not know, but there is a huge need for it out here. Women are dying, or they are staying in situations where they can die, and this has only been exacerbated by the pandemic. I would also like to make sure that when those funds are reallocated, they are allocated to nonprofits to represent communities of color as well and not just the mainstream United Way type of nonprofit. Nothing against the United Way, but there are big nonprofits and there are small ones, and I would just like to see it be equitable. Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 526?

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

I am sorry to be late. Of course I am supporting this bill, and may I please proceed, Madam Chair?

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Go ahead.

Dora Martinez:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for this commonsense bill; it is inclusive, diverse, equitable, and accessible for all. We appreciate you all and hope you pass this.

Torrey A. Russell, Founder, Broadway in the H.O.O.D.:

I am truly, truly grateful and honored and in complete support of this bill. Absolutely. We are truly thankful for our slice of the pie. Broadway in the H.O.O.D. is an organization that trains and educates young people in theater and in the arts of all different races, ethnicities, and backgrounds. Thank you so much. We support this bill and support everything that you all do for the community.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will move your testimony to the support column. Is there anyone else who would like to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 526? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify as neutral on Assembly Bill 526? [There was no one.] Does the presenter of the bill have any closing comments?

Treasurer Conine:

I really wanted to thank Erik Jimenez and Kirsten Van Ry from my staff. We spent a lot of time going through these nonprofits. I encourage anyone on the Committee and anyone in the public, if you really want to be inspired, just pick a name on this list, google them, and look at the work that they are doing. Every time we would turn over a new leaf, we would find something else—other people trying to save Nevada—and that is really great. We would also like to thank Miles Dickson and Nevada GrantLab, who helped us with a lot of the data collection. For anyone who does not know, Nevada GrantLab is an organization that helps other nonprofits do better and build capacity. As Sarah Adler said, one of the things we certainly learned during the pandemic was that we needed to be able to scale quickly and fast, and Nevada GrantLab is helping organizations do that.

Finally, I would just like to say that I think this is an intent for government to get out of government's way. We know where the work is being done; we know who is doing the work; and we know we have some resources to help them do that. Thanks to a lot of hard work by the Legal Division and the Fiscal Analysis Division and a bunch of other people, I think we are in a place to help some folks. Thanks so much for hearing the bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 526 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 527.

**Assembly Bill 527: Revises provisions relating to state financial administration.
(BDR 31-1199)**

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

The Chair has asked me to walk the Committee through Assembly Bill 527. For the record, as staff of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Fiscal Analysis Division, I am neither in support of nor in opposition to any piece of legislation. I am providing this as information for the Committee.

Assembly Bill 527 requires the Chief of the Budget Division of the Office of Finance, Office of the Governor, to include the total amount of appropriations included in the budget submitted by the Judicial and Legislative Departments of the state and the Public Employees' Retirement System as well as the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency in the calculation of reserve in the proposed budget.

The bill also includes the dollar thresholds for changes in work programs requiring the Governor's approval under certain emergency and expeditious circumstances or Interim Finance Committee (IFC) approval from \$75,000 to \$100,000. Additionally, the bill

modifies the provisions relating to the work programs approved by the Governor related to cases of emergency, or for the protection of life or property. The bill requires the Governor to notify the Chair of the Interim Finance Committee before approving the work program, rather than reporting his or her approval of the work program at the next IFC meeting. Further, the bill eliminates the existing requirement that the IFC is required to consider a request for a work program revision within 45 days after its submission, and instead requires, with an exception, the placement of the request on the agenda of the next meeting of the IFC.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, does anyone have any questions on the bill? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 527? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 527? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 527? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 527 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 208 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 208 (1st Reprint): Establishes a program to provide structured family caregiving to certain recipients of Medicaid. (BDR 38-297)

Assemblywoman Venicia Considine, Assembly District No. 18:

I want to thank you for the opportunity to present Assembly Bill 208 (1st Reprint), which establishes a structured family care giving program for certain Medicaid recipients. With me today is Benjamin Challinor, Director of Public Policy at the Alzheimer's Association. Just a short background before I turn the presentation over to him. Assembly Bill 208 (1st Reprint) came from a recommendation presented to the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults with Special Needs in March 2022. At its final meeting, the Legislative Committee voted unanimously to submit this bill before you today.

Assembly Bill 208 (1st Reprint) creates and allows a structured family care giving program for Medicaid recipients with dementia. Under this bill, the recipient is able to choose his or her caregiver and the residence where the recipient will receive caregiving. The caregiver must receive certain training, be employed with a personal care services agency or an intermediary service organization, and receive a daily stipend through this employer. Essentially, you have a family member with dementia or Alzheimer's disease, and you want to stay in the home and help take care of them. People have done this and have gone into bankruptcy because they cannot take care of a family member and hold down a job. This bill seeks to remedy that in some respects. To talk about the fiscal information, I will turn it over to Mr. Challinor.

Benjamin Challinor, Director, Public Policy, Alzheimer's Association:

I am here to represent the over 50,000 Nevadans living with dementia, and their families and caregivers. The amendment that was adopted significantly reduced the attached fiscal notes. The first one from the Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services, removed the fiscal note completely. The one from the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy had the most significant decrease from \$91 million over the following biennium to \$1.2 million, with a significant portion of that coming from federal

matching funds. Lastly, there was a clarification from the fiscal note from the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services indicating that 90 percent of that will be coming from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Additionally, one last thing I wanted to note, in the state of Nevada over \$1.3 billion of unpaid care is given to those living with dementia, so this will be a significant help to those who are living with it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions?

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

You did say that the fiscal note came down to \$1.2 million with the majority being federal funding. Can you let us know what percentage is federal and what percentage is state?

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

The way the original bill was drafted, it would apply to the entire Home- and Community-Based Services (HCBS) Waiver program. This new amendment narrows down that population so we can get a new waiver and focus specifically on people with dementia. The State General Fund impact for the biennium is \$151,062, and that includes medical spend, staffing, and system costs. I would also note that it is funded using general FMAP [Federal Medical Assistance Percentage] percentages; it is not funded at the 90:10 enhanced ratio.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

A major difference—I like that number. There was an additional fiscal note from the Aging and Disability Services Division. Is there anyone here to address that one?

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

With the amendment, we are able to remove our fiscal note, and we will be able to do this with our existing staff.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Zero is even better. Thank you. I think the last fiscal note that we had was from the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services. There was a fiscal note of \$722,400 for information technology (IT) for the 2023-2025 biennium. Do you know if that has been removed? There has been a lot of funding this legislative session going into IT-related costs. Is there anyone who can address that fiscal note?

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

Our fiscal note is for a system update, and it would be funded at a 90:10 ratio. The state-appropriated amount would be \$72,240 out of the original \$722,400.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

There has been a lot of software and IT things that have been appropriated this legislative session. Do you still need that \$72,240?

Kelly Cantrelle:

Yes, we would. This would be necessary to add an additional aid code for the specific population.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenters?

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

I just want to clarify that with the revised waiver service population, you are looking at Alzheimer's, dementia, and related conditions. I just want to be clear relative to that, but there is not an age limit. Early onset patients would also have access to this, is that correct?

Stacie Weeks:

I have to follow up with you on that. I think everyone is typically eligible as an adult for a HCBS waiver, but I will have to follow up. I apologize.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I invite anyone who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 208 (1st Reprint) to the table.

Andrew LePeilbet, representing United Veterans Legislative Council:

We are in support of A.B. 208 (R1). This is a problem for some of our veterans today. Everyone thinks that you get VA [Veterans Affairs] benefits, but the majority of our veterans do not get VA benefits. This bill will have an impact on those veterans who are suffering from dementia and likely ills today where their spouses are taken care of. And by the way, it could be a male or female spouse; we have a lot more women in our military and veterans today. This is an important bill to help those who are left out on an island by themselves. Thank you.

Shelbie Swartz, representing Battle Born Progress:

We are in strong support of this bill because all Nevadans deserve to have the opportunity to take the time to take care of their loved ones if they need additional care and attention. Thank you so much, and please support this bill.

Constance McMullen, representing Personal Care Association of Nevada:

We are in strong support of A.B. 208 (R1) and believe that this will bring extended services to people who highly need it and desperately need it. This is a matter of notation, but this still has to be approved by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 208 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 208 (R1)?

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

I apologize. I do want to support this bill, and I ditto all the prior callers.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 208 (R1) and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 292 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 292 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing offenders. (BDR 16-252)

Assemblywoman Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16:

Assembly Bill 292 (1st Reprint) is the result of the work of community organizations that have been working in and out of different prison facilities throughout the state of Nevada. This bill is seeking to address some of the health concerns and preventive care that we are seeing currently in the prisons. I believe that there is somebody here from the Department of Corrections to testify about the fiscal note. I am also going to hand it off to Lilith Baran from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) who will have more information and can go into detail about the fiscal note.

Lilith Baran, Policy Manager, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

Assembly Bill 292 (1st Reprint) has been in the works for about two years with incarcerated women. We have remarks that you received from some of the women who worked on the bill. We have also worked with Nevada NOW, the Mass Liberation Project, Planned Parenthood, and many other people. This bill originally did call for an ombudsman—that part has been removed—and that is what the fiscal note addresses right now. The Department of Corrections (NDOC) references sections 4 and 15 of the bill which called for ombudsman positions, and both of those sections are removed from the bill. We believe that it has a \$0 fiscal note.

What this bill does is create an avenue to ensure that women who are incarcerated are receiving the products that they need in the amounts that are needed. We received many complaints about the amount of period products that they received as well as obstetrical care, pelvic examinations, and mammograms. You will also see that the counties have removed their fiscal notes because this does not apply to jails; it is only prisons. If menstrual products were added as a fiscal note, and if all of the women needed an entire box of menstrual products every month, at my estimate of \$10 per month—which is a little bit over what it would cost in the store—it would cost \$114,000 annually for these products. Again, this is not a fiscal note that was given to us; this is an estimate if for some reason there would be one for menstrual products.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members are there any questions on A.B. 292 (R1)? Is there anyone here from NDOC who can address the fiscal note that was submitted? It was submitted on the original bill.

Kirk Widmar, Chief, Offender Management Division, Department of Corrections:

With the deletion of section 4 and section 15, the Department is happy to report that we will rescind our fiscal note and report a fiscal impact of \$0.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenters or for NDOC? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 292 (1st Reprint)?

Katie Brandon, representing Return Strong:

We are in strong support of A.B. 292 (R1). The preventive care outlined in this bill will help us catch, prevent, and treat health problems early, which we know will ultimately save the state and the NDOC medical staff money as well as the need for specialized personnel. In addition, we conducted a survey with Return Strong of about 400 incarcerated people in Nevada, and 79 percent of the women we surveyed said they do not have enough money for menstrual products when they need them. This bill is important and necessary. Thank you for hearing it, and please vote yes.

Annette Magnus, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress:

Thank you for hearing this bill. We are here today in proud support of this bill. Having a period is something that many people deal with, and it is something for which you do need products and proper medical care to make sure that you are taking care of yourself. We also know that reproductive care is basic health care, and every person needs that. We believe this investment is critical and that all people who are incarcerated deserve health care. Thank you.

Erica Roth, Government Affairs Liaison, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:

I think the bill speaks for itself, and we urge your support. Thank you.

Caroline Mello Roberson, Southwest Regional Director, NARAL Pro-Choice America:

I am here to testify in support of this bill and to thank our partners at the ACLU and Lilith Baran, who have really shepherded this forward. This body has already spoken loudly and clearly that we believe in dignity for women, and that includes the ability to support folks who are going through menstruation. For those who are incarcerated, this is even more essential. NARAL has more than 48,000 members in the state, and all of them would urge you to support this.

Lindsey Harmon, Executive Director, Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada:

I am here in support of this bill, understanding that this is absolutely a moral obligation that we have to serve women who are incarcerated with the dignity they deserve. Everyone deserves basic access to health care. Thank you.

Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

I am here in support of A.B. 292 (R1). We want to thank Assemblywoman González for bringing this bill forward and the Committee for adding it to the agenda this morning. This bill is a priority for the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada and all of our almost 40 member groups, including all of the groups who spoke before me. We urge your support of this bill.

Yesenia Moya, Private Citizen:

Thank you so much, Chair Monroe-Moreno, and thank you to members of the Committee for hearing this bill today. A huge shout-out to all of the beautiful women who have helped to put this bill forward. It is absolutely necessary, and I hope that everybody else here agrees. As we have full support from so many different folks, especially our folks who have been most impacted by the inaccessibility to regular hygiene products that have resulted in multiple health issues for a lot of our communities. All we are asking for is dignity.

Debbie Springer, Executive Vice President, Public Sector, SEIU Local 1107:

Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 1107 is Nevada's largest health care and public sector union, representing nearly 20,000 workers. We believe that everyone needs to be treated with dignity and respect and have adequate health care no matter where they are residing. We support A.B. 292 (R1) and we urge the Committee to do the same. Thank you.

Ashley Gaddis, Private Citizen:

I have been formerly incarcerated at Florence McClure Women's Correctional Center, and I would like to thank the sponsors for bringing this bill to legislation and recognizing that the needs between male and female offenders are much different. I have experienced most of the things in this bill that are calling for change, and I have witnessed multiple women suffer from the lack of protection that this bill would offer. I know, and have known, multiple women who have suffered ongoing chronic medical conditions, incarcerated and post-incarceration. Some have even passed away because they never knew that they had certain conditions while they were incarcerated. As was mentioned earlier, a woman's body can be very complicated. I am going to be a little explicit here: what most women have in common is that we have a uterus, and we bleed, sometimes monthly, sometimes weekly, sometimes daily, sometimes normal, sometimes problematic. There should be no reason why a person should be limited to 18 pads a month. That is the way it is currently in the NDOC. Women are given an issue of 18 pads on the first of the month. For women who cannot afford to buy additional products, this leaves an offender pleading with an officer for more pads, which usually does not happen. It is the same with toilet paper. The issue is two rolls a week. Again, problems can happen at any time with our bodies, and rarely will you find a correctional officer who will give you an extra roll of toilet paper. This is a humiliating process to go through when you have to plead with someone to keep yourself hygienically clean. I also strongly agree with section 5 of this bill that would set a standard for male staff interaction. My experience with this has been either you are treated like a man or a victim, and neither one of those are okay. We are human, and most of us are completely broken,

spiritually, mentally, and physically, going into prison. There is no need or benefit for the loss of a woman's dignity while being incarcerated. Without the policies in this bill being passed, it will leave a great number of women coming out of prison in a worse position and mindset than they were in before they went to prison. I support this bill. Thank you.

Jeri Burton, Co-Executive Director, Nevada Chapter, National Organization for Women:

I am calling in strong support of A.B. 292 (R1). I want to thank Assemblywoman González for her sponsorship of this bill and to the Committee for hearing this bill. We have been working in coalition with the Mass Liberation Project and the ACLU and other advocates for two years, listening to currently and formerly incarcerated women to learn what important reforms are needed in Nevada prisons. We have heard that they are not treated with dignity and respect. There is little to no access to health care. They told us they have come out of prison with cancer and severe health problems due to lack of basic health care screening. We are told they are not receiving menstrual products beyond a few pads a month and punishment if another incarcerated person gives a pad to them. We know how important this is, and we are so grateful that you are hearing it. Incarcerated women face systems and policies that are designated for men and none for the women. Prisons are not equipped to provide resources or address the challenges that incarcerated women face. We ask you to pass A.B. 292 (R1) to make these changes to provide dignity and health care for incarcerated women. Thank you.

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

Today we are in strong support of A.B. 292 (R1), and we would like to thank the Committee for giving this bill a hearing. We really appreciate Assemblywoman González and all of the work that strong women have done to make this happen. I think there has been lots of testimony that really demonstrates why this bill is necessary, so we will just leave it at that. Thank you so much for your time and support.

Amber Giroux, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am in support of A.B. 292 (R1). Too many women in my community have had to free bleed, humiliate themselves, or have ended up in the medical wing because of no access to basic hygiene products. Thank you to the Committee members for hearing this today, and thank you to those who have introduced it and helped bolster it, and to our community members who are calling for dignity while incarcerated. This is a basic human right. Thank you.

Betty Guess, Volunteer and Activist, Return Strong:

I am calling today in support of A.B. 292 (R1). You all know there are specific preventive and maintenance health care needs that are unique to the female gender. This bill addresses those needs and provides free menstrual products as well as other preventive care that females need and have been spoken to previously by those going before me. I stand in agreement with their comments, and I thank the sponsors of this bill for bringing it forward and the Chair and Committee for hearing it today. I stand in strong support of A.B. 292 (R1) and urge you to pass it so these needs can be addressed on an ongoing basis in the future.

Courtney Jones, Private Citizen:

I am here in support of A.B. 292 (R1). Our incarcerated community: mothers, fathers, daughters, sons, nieces, nephews, our loved ones, are thrown away in cages under the false premise of rehabilitation in our state. That is simply inhumane punishment—an unchecked obligation by the state. There are social factors driving crime, but typically in this country, we misplaced that social responsibility on the individual. We are living in an overpoliced culture, a strained social state, and a retributive, punishment-heavy culture. Incarcerated women deserve proper educational, social, and health resources so that while they are incarcerated and after, they can carry themselves with dignity about overcoming and properly processing the harm that was caused by their actions. To treat our community members who have made these specific choices as if their health and future matters to the state, is what is important to so many community members who have come on the call today. It may be hard to admit to many because they are thrown away in cages that are so far away from our communities, but there is greatness, beauty, and love emanating from those currently locked up in cages. I hope the Committee votes to pass this bill to let incarcerated women know that they are valued, prospective members of our community.

Leslie Turner, Private Citizen:

Thank you for hearing the bill. We were not sure if it was going to get a hearing or not. As you can see, the community is really behind this bill and really wants and needs this bill. We did two years' worth of research talking to people about the fact that even though some of these things are in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* for the NDOC, they are not actually being done. That is why we brought this legislation forward, and I will leave it there. Thank you again.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 292 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 292 (R1)? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 292 (R1). The next item on our agenda is Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint): Creates the Virtual Early Childhood Family Engagement Pilot Program in the Department of Health and Human Services. (BDR S-988)

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Assembly District No. 3:

Thank you for the opportunity to present Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint), which seeks to expand early childhood education opportunities for all Nevadans by appropriating funds for a Virtual Early Childhood Family Engagement Pilot Program within the Department of Health and Human Services.

I am joined today by Lesley Pittman, representing Waterford UPSTART, which is an organization that provides services outlined in the bill. I believe Ms. Pittman shared a memo with you, Madam Chair, on the breakdown for the appropriation. Briefly, the \$8 million appropriation is broken down as follows. We project the appropriation can serve

5,290 Nevada children over the biennium. This would be double the percentage of kids currently enrolled in early childhood education programs. I want to make it very clear that this program does not replace pre-K but is an early childhood education program that supports students and can get students ready for kindergarten. The programmatic cost per child is estimated to be \$1,110. We estimate that 30 percent and 25 percent of children would need computer equipment and Internet services provided respectively, and the program would provide those services to them. The equipment cost for 1,588 students totals \$788,000, Internet service costs for 1,324 students totals \$840,000 for students most at need and those needing Internet computer equipment. The total maximum cost for that student would be \$2,200 for this program. This is in contrast with the \$9,331 per-child cost for the site-based programs. Quite honestly, we do not have enough seats, and we do not have enough teachers to significantly expand those seats. This is a temporary solution to ensure that we are providing students access to early childhood education.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenter? [There were none.] You mentioned \$8 million, and I am looking at the bill and I do not see an appropriation listing the amount you spoke of. Was that just the fiscal note for the program itself?

Assemblywoman Torres:

Yes, correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone here from the Department of Health and Human Services, Welfare and Supportive Services Division? I would like to speak to the fiscal note.

Karissa Loper Machado, Agency Manager for Child Care, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services:

This fiscal note of \$4 million per fiscal year was what the Assemblywoman had presented in her original bill, and we were using that as our example for how the program will be implemented via our agency in the future, as we do not have this level of funding to put into virtual pre-K, unfortunately.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

As you understand it, you would have to get the Wi-Fi established for the families that would be utilizing this.

Karissa Loper Machado:

That is correct. We would have programmatic implementation costs on the Division side to administer the request for proposal (RFP), review all of the applications that were submitted, and issue subawards or contracts to the awardee. In that case, we would give the remaining funds of about \$1,110 per child to the vendor awarded under the RFP to administer the program costs. That would include providing the Wi-Fi to the families who needed it, buying the computers to give to the families who needed it, and to pay for the program costs for the vendors themselves who would administer the program.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you so much for that clarification. Members, do you have any questions?

Assemblywoman Peters:

Thank you for continuing to work on this bill, and I appreciate how far it has gone. I wanted to talk a bit about scalability of the program. We are asking for \$8 million in the biennium; would you please talk about what it costs to implement a program like this versus being able to fund each child?

Lesley Pittman, representing Waterford UPSTART:

The dollar figures that we put into this original \$8 million provision in A.B. 348 (R1) requesting funds to implement, were based on an organization's ability to recruit 5,290 kids over the biennium. Waterford UPSTART, speaking for them specifically, provides this type of program in all 50 states; 11 of which are publicly funded. What we do is recruit the families, and then we provide the program curriculum through our parent coaches who work with the families to make sure that the kids are participating in this program correctly. They also are a resource for parents if they have questions. We also have the experience installing the Internet service and also providing the laptops to the individual families where neither Internet nor a laptop exists. That is all done by the vendor who would secure this program funding through that RFP process. The original bill that we had before the appropriation was struck in error during the work session, also had a 7.5 percent set-aside allocated to the agency for the administrative cost of running the program.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

You just said something about an appropriation being taken out in error in the amendment.

Assemblywoman Torres:

There was an appropriation that was supposed to be in the bill and in drafting, was not put in because the wording of the conceptual amendment made it appear that the fiscal note would have been removed and that it would be implementing an entire program with absolutely no funding. The fiscal note was added on the back end through the Department of Health and Human Services.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for that. Currently, this is a program run through the Department of Health and Human Services, or would this be something new—a change to the existing program that is going on in the state?

Karissa Loper Machado:

We are currently running a pilot program with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds that is very similar to this. We are in the process of drafting the award to the vendor, so unfortunately I have no data to give you about how the program has gone so far.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

What is the current annual amount that you are paying for that pilot program?

Karissa Loper Machado:

The TANF program has put in \$1 million, and I believe the vendor has an in-kind match, or MOE [Maintenance of Effort] of \$1 million as well.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions?

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I thought we had services like this already in progress. Can someone explain to me the difference between this program that we are discussing today and other programs already in progress on early childhood development education?

Lesley Pittman:

The program that Karissa Loper Machado mentioned today is strictly for TANF-eligible families. This legislation broadens the eligibility categories for this type of program to those populations that we know have the greatest challenge in terms of accessing early childhood education. Those are rural families and foster families as well as low-income families.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

That is your target audience—foster families and rural families—very good.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who wishes to testify in support of A.B. 348 (R1)?

Charlie De La Paz, representing Moapa Valley rural community:

We are greatly in support of this bill as it will absolutely expand and benefit any programs that we have there.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 348 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 348 (R1)?

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

I am actually calling in support. We would like to thank Assemblywoman Torres for bringing this bill. It is an equity bill, and it really does help people who have a disability in the rural area and cannot drive, and also the foster families and people who just cannot fit in the regular box. We appreciate this bill, and we hope you all sponsor it. Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

There is currently an existing pilot program that is costing approximately \$2 million over the biennium, or annually?

Karissa Loper Machado:

I will need to clarify whether that was an annual cost or biennial cost for you. I will get that back to the Committee.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you. After hearing the testimony that the appropriation amount was inadvertently removed from the bill itself, if there was an appropriation of a lower amount associated in the bill and amended into the bill, would there still be the additional cost for the personnel, operating equipment, and information that is included in your fiscal note?

Karissa Loper Machado:

I believe we could rescind our fiscal note and issue the RFP and do the work with our existing staff. We would still need the programmatic funds to award to the RFP vendor awardee.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

If the appropriation amount remained the same, you would only be able to assist the same number of children, correct? Would you be able to expand the program at all?

Karissa Loper Machado:

I want to make sure I understand the question.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Currently you are expending—it is either \$2 million on an annual basis or biennial basis—for a certain number of children. It has been a pilot program. Do you anticipate being able to expand the number of children who would be in the program with the same number of dollars, or to get to the number of children that was listed, would you need the full \$8 million?

Karissa Loper Machado:

In order to expand the number of children being served, I do not want to say that we would need the \$4 million. It is a math problem in that whatever amount the Assembly feels is appropriate to put into the program would break down to the number of per-child costs, and we would serve as many children as possible with the amount appropriated to us.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I do have the original bill before the reprint in front of me. Section 8 of the original piece of language, if it was the desire of the Committee to add this language back in, I would suggest that we keep that language from the original section 8 of the bill that also allows for the Department to allocate not more than 7.5 percent of the appropriated sum for each fiscal year to itself to administer the program and that covers those costs.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint).

[The Committee recessed at 11:38 a.m. and reconvened at 11:58 a.m.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations requiring certain one-time payments and salary increases for state officers and employees. (BDR S-768)

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6:

I am here today to present Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint). This particular bill is an important one. I will note that there is an amendment that addresses some of the changes that have been made to the bill. It is proposed amendment 3744 in a mock-up form [[Exhibit C](#)].

Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint) relates to some paid provisions for several units of collective bargaining here in the state of Nevada. I will talk about some of the pieces of it, as introduced, because I think it is important for context. As introduced and passed out of the Senate, Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint) authorized and funded a 2 percent cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for all state employees beginning retroactively on April 1, 2023. The sections of S.B. 440 (R1) related to this 2 percent COLA—sections 5 through 8—in this mock-up have been removed from the bill in the amendment. I would note, however, that the 2023 Pay Bill, Assembly Bill 522, includes that 2 percent COLA for all state employees to begin on July 1, 2023, on top of the COLAs that were recommended by the Governor in his budget. As introduced and passed out of the Senate, S.B. 440 (R1) also appropriated funding to the State Board of Examiners to fund retroactive COLAs and other payments for members of five collective bargaining units. The State Board of Examiners approved agreements with these five bargaining units in the interim between the 2021 and 2023 sessions. However, no funding was provided for the provisions of the agreements that dealt with employee compensation because the Legislature was not in session. Thus, there was no authority to appropriate those funds. Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint), as introduced would have provided funding for this purpose on a retroactive basis. The proposed amendment that you see before you appropriates \$20.4 million in State General Funds and \$3.1 million in State Highway Funds to the State Board of Examiners for one-time payments for members of the same five collective bargaining units. The Governor's Finance Office and Department of Administration would be tasked with determining the amount each eligible employee would receive, and this determination would be based on job title, position, classification, length of employment, and other factors as determined by these agencies.

The dollar amount of the General Fund and Highway Fund appropriations is based on the cost estimate provided to the State Board of Examiners when the collective bargaining agreements were approved in March 2022. The Division of Human Resource Management within the Department of Administration had submitted a \$4.3 million fiscal note on the bill as introduced. However, based on conversations between the Legislative Counsel Bureau Fiscal Analysis Division and the Department of Administration, the proposed amendment completely removes that particular fiscal note.

I want to talk a little about some of the collective bargaining units so that we know what employees would be covered by this. This amendment is an attempt to facilitate payments to these employee groups where we have heard that it would be extremely difficult to go in retroactively to enact these particular provisions that were contained in the collective bargaining agreements that were reached, went to arbitration, and then were approved by the State Board of Examiners. This is an attempt to make those employees whole in a fashion that will allow for this money to actually get out the door to them in the form of a lump-sum payment, also recognizing that the COLAs that were negotiated will be on a going-forward basis which also removes that retroactivity, and that is included. Members of this Committee have been involved in the conversations around state employee pay and particularly some of these bargaining units. This is sort of a compromise to allow for those employees to get that compensation in the form of a one-time payment instead of a retroactive pay piece that will allow for smoother administration and allow for that money to actually get to them.

These particular collective bargaining units that are covered by the bill include five different pieces. The first piece is bargaining group A: labor, maintenance, custodial, and institutional employees, including employees of penal and correctional institutions who are not responsible for security at those institutions. Bargaining group E, which are professional employees who provide health care, including physical therapists and other employees in medical and other professions related to health. Bargaining group F, which are employees other than professional employees who provide health care and personal care, including without limitation, employees who provide care for children. Bargaining group G, which are category I peace officers. Bargaining group I, which are category III peace officers.

The Highway Fund appropriation in this bill is primarily for the Department of Transportation and Nevada Highway Patrol employees whose salaries are funded through the Highway Fund. That is the appropriation from the Highway Fund. The COLA is approved by the State Board of Examiners. Again, these particular bargaining units were included in the 2023 Pay Bill and are funded on that going-forward basis. The effective date of this bill has also been amended to July 1, 2023, so that the one-time payments would occur in fiscal year (FY) 2024. The Nevada System of Higher Education set-aside of \$1.3 million is for employees covered by any of the five collective bargaining units.

I believe we have Matthew Tuma from the Department of Administration with us who can help answer any questions about the fiscal note. But based on our conversations, I believe that fiscal note has been removed. This bill really does reflect an investment in our state workers. We talked a lot about this in this Committee, and I know, Madam Chair, you are extremely passionate about it. I think we all recognize that we have to do more for our state employees if we want to continue to provide the kind of state services that our constituents need and want. These particular units went to the table with the state and negotiated for pieces of their contract—which is provided by Nevada law. We owe it to them to give them this money because this has been approved by the state. To honor our agreements is exceedingly important. By not funding this and not doing anything to address what are legitimate pieces of our state government, our law enforcement, our health care providers, people who are providing a lot of those supports, does a disservice to those employees who

came to the table, negotiated in good faith, and expected us to make good on that promise. This is an attempt to do that in a way that will allow for the efficient disbursement of the funds. I would be happy to answer any questions and would urge your support of Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint). Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Before we go to questions or comments, I am going to ask Mr. Tuma to make a few remarks about the fiscal note.

Matthew Tuma, Deputy Director, Department of Administration:

We have had ongoing conversations with Fiscal Analysis Division staff on this issue and the amendment that should be able to remove the fiscal note and the additional fiscal responsibility for the Division of Human Resource Management (DHRM). The amendment from the first reprint allows the agency to distribute this funding without a fiscal note. It is going to be distributed similarly to the retention incentive bonus that was authorized in Assembly Bill 268 as opposed to a retroactive per-employee calculation. The DHRM's fiscal note was based mainly on the manual recalculation of retroactive salary increases for the identified staff. The distribution of these one-time payments without a fiscal impact will mean that the DHRM will not be able to distribute unique amounts for individual staff. Distributions will be done in more of a categorical manner across these groups, and there will not be any manual recalculation about wages lost for any individual staff. The Department of Administration would be prepared to work with the unions that represent these groups for an equitable distribution that can be achieved within the state's existing payroll system. That can go before the State Board of Examiners (BOE), as the legislation stipulates this money would be appropriated for the BOE, and so it would go to the BOE for approval. I am available for any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I want to thank you for the simplified version of this. The State of Nevada went to the table and negotiated with our state employees, and we want to be good stewards and negotiate in good faith. We know that these dollars are owed to our state employees and finding the simplified way to distribute that pay is appreciated. I am sure the employees at the DHRM are extremely grateful for finding the simplified way to get the money in the hands of the people whom we owe it to in a timely manner. Members, are there any questions for the Majority Leader or for Mr. Tuma? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint)?

Aaron Ford II, representing Nevada Police Union:

We are in support of S.B. 440 (R1) because it is both fiscally responsible and because it enacts the arbitration agreement agreed to by the State of Nevada and the Nevada State Police. One thing to consider is that it costs about \$100,000 to train a new officer in the state system. The issue is one of turnover, because often we are seeing that these officers are leaving for opportunities that can compensate them better—and who can blame them? Unfortunately, this means that we have to repeat that costly expenditure. We are losing experience when that happens, and often we are not able to fill those vacancies. The

budgetary restraints that come from this, and things like this, and that are addressed by S.B. 440 (R1), are such that we are having to make very difficult decisions such as the inability to patrol our roads effectively. Our roads are habitually underpatrolled and in some instances unpatrolled entirely for hours at a time. I want to thank Senate Majority Leader Cannizzaro for bringing forth this fiscally responsible bill that funds the police to at least the minimal extent necessary to operate effectively. Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to S.B. 440 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position on S.B. 440 (R1)? [There was no one.] Do the presenters have any closing comments?

Senator Cannizzaro:

I wanted to thank you for taking the time in what I know is a very busy day and time of session to hear this bill. I think it is so important for our state workers who are doing essential services for us and our constituents every single day. I would be remiss if I did not give a huge shout-out to our own Fiscal staff who worked very hard to come up with a way in which we could disburse this money to those employees without creating a logistical nightmare trying to identify each individual employee and go back retroactively to adjust pay periods. I would not be sitting here if it was not for our amazing Fiscal staff. This bill is in no small part due to their ingenuity, dedication, and hard work.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 440 (R1) and open the work session on S.B. 440 (R1).

Senate Bill 440 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations requiring certain one-time payments and salary increases for state officers and employees. (BDR S-768)

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, you have heard the testimony and you have seen the amendment. Are there any questions before I ask for a motion? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 440 (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.)

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We are going to do a work session for the bills we can easily move to the floor. We have to be on the floor at one o'clock and we are going to come back at the call of the Chair. With that, we are going to open the work session for Assembly Bill 208 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 208 (1st Reprint): Establishes a program to provide structured family caregiving to certain recipients of Medicaid. (BDR 38-297)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 208 (1st Reprint) was heard today in Committee. It requires the Department of Health and Human Services to apply for a Home- and Community-based Services waiver to include structured family care, caregiving for recipients of Medicaid suffering from dementia, and includes various requirements related to submitting waivers. There were two fiscal notes that still need to be addressed. For the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, the bill would need to provide State General Fund appropriations of \$50,662 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$100,400 in FY 2025, as well as authorizations of \$85,382 in FY 2024 and \$223,781 in FY 2025. In addition, the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services also submitted an unsolicited fiscal note that would require an additional General Fund appropriation of \$72,240 in FY 2024 only, and authorizations of \$650,160. The motion, if the Committee wished to amend those amounts into the bill, would be amend and do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions on the motion? [There were none.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 208 (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.)

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will take all the floor statements. We will move on to Assembly Bill 292 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 292 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing offenders. (BDR 16-252)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Senate Bill 292 (1st Reprint) was heard today in Committee, and the bill as amended requires the Department of Corrections to ensure each woman assigned to an institutional facility completes a form to assess their medical and feminine hygiene needs, and provides each woman with certain medical and behavioral health services, and provides each woman with a sufficient supply of feminine hygiene products at no cost. I would note that the Department

of Corrections confirmed today the fiscal note they had on the original bill has been addressed with the amendment, and if the Committee wishes to move this bill, it would be a do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will accept a motion to do pass as amended.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY BILL 292 (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.)

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 396.

Assembly Bill 396: Makes an appropriation to Clark County for programs for rental assistance to certain persons. (BDR S-1011)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 396 was heard in Committee on April 3, 2023, and provides a State General Fund appropriation of \$22 million in each year of the biennium for a total of \$44 million to Clark County for programs of rental assistance to persons who are elderly, elderly persons with disabilities, and families or persons facing unanticipated emergencies. I would note that there has also been some discussion of including other municipalities within this bill. The potential amendment for this bill is to appropriate \$6 million each year to Clark County, \$1.5 million each year to the City of Reno, and \$1.5 million to the City of Sparks. If the Committee wished to provide those allocations, the motion would be amend and do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions on the amendment or to the amounts in the original bill?

Assemblyman Hafen:

I have a question on the amendment. Is the \$9 million in addition to the \$44 million or is it a replacement of the \$44 million?

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

It is a replacement of the \$44 million.

Assemblyman Hafen:

Thank you, Madam Chair. With the amendment, I will be supporting this.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Just for clarification, the original amount in the bill was \$22 million in each year of the biennium. However, after the hearing, there were other municipalities who said they had additional need. It was the decision of the Chair to utilize funding for all three of the entities stated they needed funding in a more equitable manner for the funding that they had utilized as we got through the pandemic. The one thing that we did not say was any funding that was not utilized by the end of the biennium will revert back to the State General Fund.

The amount for Clark County would be \$6 million in each year of the biennium, the City of Reno would be \$1.5 million in each year of the biennium, and the City of Sparks would receive \$1.5 million in each year of the biennium, for a total of \$18 million. I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 396.

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.)

The next item on the work session agenda is Assembly Bill 449.

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)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 449 (1st Reprint) was heard on May 31, 2023. The bill as amended revises provisions governing the correction of the tax roll and issuance of credits or refunds of property taxes when an applicable partial abatement of taxes was not applied or claimed. The bill authorizes the county treasurer to correct the tax roll for the immediately preceding fiscal year if the county assessor notifies the county treasurer during the current fiscal year that a taxpayer is entitled to that partial abatement for a single-family, owner-occupied home. There appears to be no fiscal impact as a result of the amendment. This would be a do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS AS AMENDED
ASSEMBLY Bill 449 (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.)

The next item on our work session agenda is Assembly Bill 484.

Assembly Bill 484: Makes an appropriation to the Office of Economic Development in the Office of the Governor for the support of designated regional development authorities. (BDR S-1144)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 484 was heard today in Committee. The bill appropriates \$700,000 in State General Funds to the Office of Economic Development in the Office of the Governor for support of designated regional development authorities. The motion would be a do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, we heard this bill this morning. Are there any questions on this bill? [There were none.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 484.

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.)

The next item on our work session agenda will be Assembly Bill 526.

**Assembly Bill 526: Revises provisions relating to state financial administration.
(BDR S-1205)**

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 526, otherwise known as the pie bill, provides for the redistribution of certain money authorized for expenditures to certain nonprofit organizations. There do not appear to be any amendments, so the motion would be do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, again, we heard this bill a little earlier today. Are there any questions? [There were none.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 526.

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.)

We will work session Assembly Bill 527 to close out the morning.

**Assembly Bill 527: Revises provisions relating to state financial administration.
(BDR 31-1199)**

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 527 was also heard today and requires the Chief of the Budget Division to include the total amount of appropriations included in the budget submitted by both the Judicial and Legislative Branches of the state, as well as the Public Employees' Retirement System and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, in the calculation of reserves in the proposed budget. In addition, the bill also increases the dollar threshold for changes to work programs requiring governmental approval under certain emergency and expeditious circumstances of the Interim Finance Committee. There are no additional fiscal impacts. If the Committee wishes to move this, the motion would be do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 527.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman O'Neill:

There are parts of this bill that I like, and there are parts I have some questions on. I am going to vote yes to get it out, but I want to work with some persons to see what can be done on it too. There are some questions I had for the Governor's Finance Office.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

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

We will stand in recess and return at the call of the Chair.

[The Committee recessed at 12:38 p.m. and reconvened at 7:37 p.m.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will start with some of the one-shots because a lot of you have been waiting for two days. The first item on the agenda will be Senate Bill 453, which makes appropriations to restore the balance in the Emergency Account and the Contingency Account.

Senate Bill 453: Makes appropriations to restore the balances in the Emergency Account and the Contingency Account. (BDR S-1098)

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

Senate Bill 453 appropriates \$145,237 in State General Funds to replenish the emergency accounts created by *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 353.263. This bill also appropriates \$22 million in General Funds to replenish the Contingency Account created by NRS 353.266. This concludes my presentation, and I stand ready for any questions the Committee may have.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you so much. Members, do you have any questions? [There were none.] Is there is anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 453? [There was no one.]

Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to Senate Bill 453? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to give neutral testimony on Senate Bill 453? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 453. I will open the work session, and I will accept a motion to do pass Senate Bill 453.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 453.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I have to say contrary to some fake news media outlets, I will be voting yes on this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

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

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 455.

Senate Bill 455: Makes an appropriation to the Office of the Lieutenant Governor for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1111)

Rudy Pamintuan, Chief of Staff, Office of the Lieutenant Governor:

This is just for a small appropriation to the Office of the Lieutenant Governor to replace the old, outdated computer hardware and associated software.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, you have the bill in front of you which makes a onetime appropriation of \$7,392. Are there any questions for the presenter? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 455? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to Senate Bill 455? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to give neutral testimony on Senate Bill 455? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 455 and open the work session on Senate Bill 455 and accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 455.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

The next item on our agenda is Senate Bill 456, which makes appropriations to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor for the cost of leases and furniture for state offices and training for state employees.

Senate Bill 456: Makes appropriations to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor for the costs of leases and furniture for state offices and training for state employees. (BDR S-1113)

Jack Robb, Director, Department of Administration:

Senate Bill 456 makes appropriations to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor for cost of leases and of furniture for state offices and training for state employees. Section 1 appropriates \$50 million for the cost of leases and furniture going forward; section 2 appropriates \$5 million for training of state employees; and section 3 calls for any money that is not spent by September 19, 2025, to be reverted into the State General Fund.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the Director? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in support of Senate Bill 456? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 456? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on Senate Bill 456? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 456 and open the work session for Senate Bill 456, and I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 456.

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.)

The next item on our work session agenda will be Senate Bill 457, which makes an appropriation to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor for certain costs related to the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and costs for interdisciplinary opportunities for health students at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Senate Bill 457: Makes an appropriation to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor for certain costs related to the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and costs for interdisciplinary opportunities for health students at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. (BDR S-1119)

Constance J. Brooks, Vice President, Office of Government and Community Engagement, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

It is with great pleasure that I assist with the presentation for Senate Bill 457, which is to fund the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine. As you are aware, Nevada is considered a physician-shortage state, and S.B. 457 is a measure to

help address this challenge. The Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine at UNLV is requesting \$9.2 million to expand the medical school to grow the class size from 60 students to 90 students, and to hire the requisite faculty aligned with accreditation standards.

I would like to note that in Senate Finance, we received clarification as to why this is being considered a one-shot appropriation versus an enhancement. As was stated on the record by Legislative Counsel Bureau Fiscal Analysis Division staff, the one-shot label is due to the need for fiscal year 2023 expenditures to be spent down before being added to the operational base in the future biennium. I mention this because this label is significant for our accreditors who need to see ongoing state support for the expansion and growth plan. To speak more about the growth plan and expenditures, I will turn it over to our Vice Dean of the Kerkorian School of Medicine, Dr. Alison Netski, and she is with us via Zoom.

Alison Netski, M.D., Professor, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health; Vice Dean for Clinical Affairs, Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

As you have heard, the School of Medicine has a plan between now and 2030 to increase our class size from where it is with 60 students per year to a target of 90 students per year. In order to achieve this goal, we need added support to increase our faculty size, not only for our basic science faculty, who have a primary role in education during the first two years, but also to support our recruitment of more clinical faculty, which is where we have a real need to be able to accommodate the added students on their clerkships for all of the requirements that are needed for accreditation by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education. This will include supporting recruitments for approximately 100 new faculty over the next two years. And while that may seem somewhat of an aggressive approach, we have been very successful with recruitment, and there is a lot of excitement in the academic medicine community nationwide about our school of medicine. In addition to the recruitment of new faculty, the funding will support operating costs for the medical education building that many of you may have seen in the medical district, for the next two years and the start of the UNLV Academic Health Center. The Center will support multiple interdisciplinary activities at not only the School of Medicine but the other associated health professions with much-needed startup expenses for things such as a grants writer, an interdisciplinary clinical education manager, and a principal contract manager, in addition to some other key faculty and support staff that will be needed to have a robust start for this multidisciplinary effort. Finally, what I had mentioned would be the support for the faculty expansion to support the increase in the class size.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Any amounts that are not expended by September 19, 2025, will revert back to the State General Fund, correct?

Constance J. Brooks:

That is correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for either of our presenters? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 457?

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

The Nevada System of Higher Education is in strong support of S.B. 457.

Kelly Crompton, Government Affairs Manager, City of Las Vegas:

We support this measure as the School of Medicine is an important part of the medical district in downtown Las Vegas.

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

We are in strong support of this for our colleagues down south. Thank you.

Dylan Keith, Assistant Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

To address the doctor shortage in southern Nevada, we are in strong support of this measure and we would ask for your support for this funding. Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to Senate Bill 457? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on Senate Bill 457? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 457 and open the work session for Senate Bill 457 and accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 457.

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 would like to announce that Assembly Bill 525 was going to be heard and go to work session tonight, and I was just informed that there is someone on the line waiting for that bill. I will let you know we are not going to hear that bill tonight. We will do it tomorrow. If you were joining us by the telephone, you can go ahead and enjoy the rest of your evening and we will see you tomorrow on that bill.

I will move on to the next bill on our agenda, Senate Bill 458, which makes an appropriation to the Office of the State Treasurer for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software.

Senate Bill 458: Makes an appropriation to the Office of the State Treasurer for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1122)

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

We will be brief. Senate Bill 458 makes a fiscal year 2024 State General Fund appropriation in the amount of \$57,016 to the Treasurer's Office to fund replacement computer equipment per the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services' recommended replacement schedule. I could go into detail, but I do not think you want me to, so I am happy to take any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Just to confirm that any unspent appropriated amounts would revert back to the State General Fund on or before September 19, 2025. Correct?

Erik Jimenez:

Per section 1, subsection 2, that is correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 458? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to Senate Bill 458? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on Senate Bill 458? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 458 and open the work session for Senate Bill 458 and I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 458.

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.)

The next bill will be Senate Bill 459, which makes an appropriation to the Account for Pensions for Silicosis, Diseases Related to Asbestos and Other Disabilities.

Senate Bill 459: Makes an appropriation to the Account for Pensions for Silicosis, Diseases Related to Asbestos and Other Disabilities. (BDR S-1124)

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

I am here to present Senate Bill 459. Pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 617.1675, the State Treasurer is responsible for administering the Account for Pensions for Silicosis, Diseases Related to Asbestos and Other Disabilities.

This fund was established in 1975 to provide silicosis and disabled pension fund benefits for diagnosed employees, their dependents, widows, widowers, surviving children, or surviving parents pursuant to statute. Historically, this fund has required a series of State General Fund one-shot appropriations since money was swept in the 2008 Special Session to increase General Fund reserves. The last legislatively approved one-shot appropriation was approved in 2021 through Assembly Bill 453 of the 81st Session. We estimate that annual payments for this fiscal year to total approximately \$18,500. Senate Bill 459 requests \$35,000 for the biennium to continue payments in accordance with NRS 617.168. Over the last six fiscal years, the annual payments have averaged \$25,542 with a year-over-year decrease of approximately 8 percent.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of S.B. 459? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to S.B. 459? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 459? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on S.B. 459 and open the work session, and I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 459.

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.)

Our next bill will be Senate Bill 460, which makes an appropriation to the Office of the State Controller for a debt collection information technology system.

Senate Bill 460: Makes an appropriation to the Office of the State Controller for a debt collection information technology system. (BDR S-1125)

Andy Matthews, State Controller:

I am here to present Senate Bill 460, which makes appropriations to the Office of the State Controller for debt collection. The gentleman to my right is James Smack, Chief Deputy Controller, and he is going to briefly walk through the details of this bill. Thank you for your time, and I will turn things over to James.

James Smack, Chief Deputy Controller, Office of the State Controller:

Senate Bill 460 appropriates \$1.98 million from the State General Fund for a new debt collection system for the Office of the State Controller. Approximately \$1.6 million would be for the debt collection system itself and about \$380,000 for maintenance for two years.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Earlier in the session, we had a conversation about debt collection. By getting the new system, will that assist in collecting long-term debts that have been on the books for a while?

James Smack:

This is going to modernize the solution that we already have. It will be able to work more seamlessly with whatever ERP [Enterprise Resource Planning] system we end up with in the future, along with the additional staff member whom we discussed in our previous conversation. We have set a goal of increasing our collections by a minimum of 25 percent in the next fiscal year. I do not believe this system would be completely installed until probably the fiscal year after that, but I would anticipate that it will be able to increase collections even beyond that. Depending on when the system is ready to go live and operational and ready for use, I would be more than happy to provide you with updated projections for fiscal year 2025, at that point in time.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, any questions for the Controller's Office? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 460? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to S.B. 460? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on Senate Bill 460? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 460 and open the work session for Senate Bill 460, and I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 460.

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.)

The next bill on our agenda is Senate Bill 461 and I will open the hearing.

Senate Bill 461: Makes appropriations to the Office of the State Controller for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software and certain equipment. (BDR S-1126)

Andy Matthews, State Controller:

Senate Bill 461 makes appropriations to the Office of the State Comptroller for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software and certain equipment. Once again, Mr. Smack will briefly walk through the bill details.

James Smack, Chief Deputy Controller, Office of the State Controller:

This bill makes an allocation to the Office of the State Controller according to the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services' schedule in order to make necessary replacements to servers, computer equipment within our office, audiovisual equipment in our conference room, and an air-conditioning system in our secure check printing room in the basement of the Capitol building.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of S.B. 461? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to S.B. 461? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 461? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on S.B. 461 and open the work session for S.B. 461, and I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 461.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Watts:

I appreciate the expeditious action.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

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

I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 462, which makes an appropriation to the Nevada Indian Commission for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software.

Senate Bill 462: Makes an appropriation to the Nevada Indian Commission for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1131)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

This bill provides \$5,457 for replacement computer hardware.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions on Senate Bill 462? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of S.B. 462? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to S.B. 462? [There was no one.] Is there anyone

who would like to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 462? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing for S.B. 462 and open the work session for S.B. 462, and I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 462.

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 open the hearing for Senate Bill 463, which makes an appropriation to the Nevada Arts Council within the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software.

Senate Bill 463: Makes an appropriation to the Nevada Arts Council within the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1133)

Tony Manfredi, Executive Director, Nevada Arts Council, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs:

Senate Bill 463 appropriates \$26,170 for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software that is in compliance with the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services' replacement schedule. Funds not expended before September 19, 2025, would be reverted to the State General Fund. Thank you for the opportunity to present to you this evening, and this concludes my presentation.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 463? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to Senate Bill 463? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in neutral on Senate Bill 463? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 463, and I will open the work session for Senate Bill 463 and accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 463.

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 open the hearing on the next item on our agenda, which is Senate Bill 464.

Senate Bill 464: Makes an appropriation to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Office of State Public Defender within the Department of Indigent Defense Services for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1135)

Marcie E. Ryba, Executive Director, Department of Indigent Defense Services:
Senate Bill 464 is for standard computer replacement pursuant to the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services' schedule, and I can answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

You have another bill on tonight's agenda, and I believe we have taken care of that in another bill, so would you still need the other bill?

Marcie E. Ryba:

Are you referring to Senate Bill 479?

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Correct.

Marcie E. Ryba:

The appropriation made in Senate Bill 479 is for this current fiscal year, not for the 2023-2025 biennium. I believe we still need it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will finish the hearing on this one, and then we will open the next one. I just wanted to get you out of here a little earlier. Members, do you have any questions on Senate Bill 464? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of S.B. 464? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to S.B. 464? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in the neutral position on S.B. 464? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on S.B. 464 and open the work session for S.B. 464, and I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 464.

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 open the hearing for Senate Bill 479.

Senate Bill 479: Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Indigent Defense Services for an unanticipated shortfall to fund costs in excess of the maximum contribution amounts of counties for the provision of indigent defense services. (BDR S-1102)

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

Senate Bill 479 provides an appropriation to the Department of Indigent Defense Services to reimburse our rural counties for the maximum contribution formula for fiscal year 2023. We did not have any funding appropriated in our current budget, so we would be required to go to the Interim Finance Committee to reimburse our rural counties. Because the Legislature is in session, we cannot go to Interim Finance, and hence we are asking for a supplemental appropriation.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 479? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 479? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on Senate Bill 479? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 479 and will open the work session for Senate Bill 479 and I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 479.

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 open the hearing for Senate Bill 487.

Senate Bill 487: Makes an appropriation to the Department of Indigent Defense Services for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1134)

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

This bill is to replace computer hardware and software pursuant to the Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services' standard replacement schedule, and I can answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none]. Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 487? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 487? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on Senate Bill 487? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 487, and will open the work session for Senate Bill 487 and will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 487.

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.)

We will open the hearing for Senate Bill 465, which makes an appropriation to the Department of Taxation for the cost of a feasibility study and requests for the proposals for a real-time sales tax point-of-sale system.

Senate Bill 465: Makes an appropriation to the Department of Taxation for the costs of a feasibility study and request for proposals for a real-time sales tax point-of-sale system. (BDR S-1152)

Jennifer Roebuck, Deputy Executive Director, Compliance Division, Department of Taxation:

The Department is requesting an appropriation of \$605,600 for the cost of a feasibility study followed by request for proposal for a system to collect sales tax in real time. Conceptually, the goal of this program is to provide a solution to assist small businesses in their tax management as well as the state in its tax collection efforts. In any case, participation by taxpayers would be convenient and beneficial, preserving a desirable voluntary compliance aspect of business in Nevada. We will do our best to answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions of the presenters?

Assemblywoman Kasama:

I am a little confused because a lot of casinos and restaurants have points-of-sale. What are you trying to accomplish with the study?

Jennifer Roebuck:

The way it stands, currently our taxpayers file a monthly return. If they, for example, have a sale at the beginning of the month, it could be up to another month before they actually send their remittance of that sales tax. Meanwhile it is sitting in their bank account, and what can often happen is taxpayers will inadvertently spend it on something else before they actually get it to the Department of Taxation in order for it to be distributed to the various counties and programs.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

You would rather it gets into the state's bank account faster.

Jennifer Roebuck:

That is the idea. One of the things that is actually occurring throughout the many parts of the world is continuous transaction control. That is like a clearinghouse where invoices are run through in real time. I know that several states have already attempted to do this, but they have actually failed because of the way they have attempted to do it. We are trying to do a feasibility study to see if it is something that would work for Nevada, and it is intended to help small businesses. That is the reason behind this—to help them out—and also to help the state to get the money out to the programs more quickly. We believe this is going to be the wave of the future and that it is coming; it is just a matter of how it is going to happen. One thing that we are doing at the Department is we are in the middle of a request for proposal for a unified tax system, and that could be part of it. It is hard to know without being able to get that information, which is why we would need to study.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

What challenges do you foresee for our retailers, payment processing companies, and card issuers?

Jennifer Roebuck:

I do not know. We have done some research to see what other states have tried. I know Massachusetts was probably the biggest attention getter because they have tried to do it a couple of times, and they have put the burden on those payment processors. That is why it did not work. Maybe this is something that we would be able to partner with them. It is hard to know, without that feasibility study in our hands, to see what the results could be. Is it something that we could move forward with, if not now at some point in the future, that might be helpful for us?

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

You are looking at a multitude of options?

Jennifer Roebuck:

Yes, absolutely. One of the things I wanted to mention is that I know there are concerns out there, and we fully understand that, and it is not our intention to just do something without that feedback. Once the study is started, we anticipate that any third-party vendor who is doing the study would seek that information from the stakeholders—not just the state of Nevada, but merchants, taxpayers, payment processors—anybody who might have a concern about this.

Assemblyman Hafen:

I want to thank you for your blunt honesty that some of the states have failed. Not everybody would say that. I greatly appreciate it, but it sparked some curiosity, and my first question would be, do we know why they failed? Prior to the pandemic, I saw a significant base of our customers who repeatedly paid in cash, so I am curious how that would work with cash payments.

Jennifer Roebuck:

Your first question was whether I knew why those other attempts have failed. The state I am most familiar with is Massachusetts. There was—I do not know whether it was a feasibility study—there was something out there that talked about them putting the burden on the payment processors to do this. That is ultimately why there was so much pushback, because as I understand it, they put the burden of both the payment and also what sounded like an unreasonable amount of time to implement as the reason. I do not know about the other states. I know Arizona had proposed something, and I am not sure what happened with that. But again, we would fully explore those reasons and make sure this is not something that is going to be bad for the state of Nevada or our taxpayers. Your second question just went out of my head.

Assemblyman Hafen:

It was on the businesses that are more cash intensive.

Jennifer Roebuck:

Even cash transactions would go through a point-of-sale because the point-of-sale is not necessarily a credit card or an ATM debit card, but any time you ring up a sale, it should be going through the point-of-sale anyway. Again, the intention of this would be a voluntary program for taxpayers to use should they feel that it would lessen the burden of that lump sum payment every month.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Then no other state has an active program now; is that fair to say?

Jennifer Roebuck:

As far as I know—as of a couple of weeks ago—that is correct.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Is it just a study?

Jennifer Roebuck:

Yes, that is correct. We are fully intending to do this study to see if this is something that is feasible for the state, and once we have those results, we will ask for the funds to proceed should we be able to implement the program.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I have multiple questions dealing with refunds. Other programs such as the Brady Bill charge \$25 that dealers have been living off of regularly and fail to pay their monthly statements to the Department of Public Safety. The question I do have is how would the cannabis sales, which are strictly cash and cannot go through a bank, be involved in this program?

Jennifer Roebuck:

That is a very good question, and again, this study would help us really understand that. I think that by the time we are to get around to this, it is entirely possible that maybe we have had some movement with the cash concerns with cannabis. I do not know that for sure, but it is possible. Maybe that would help them out. And again, even if they are using cash, they are running it through some kind of point-of-sale system in order to make sure that every sale is documented and that all the taxes are listed out. If one were to go to any store and buy something, including the local cannabis store, in every case they are required by law to give you a receipt that lines out what occurred in that sales transaction, including sales tax.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] I will open testimony in support of Senate Bill 465. [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to Senate Bill 465?

Connor Cain, representing Nevada Bankers Association:

We are in opposition to Senate Bill 465. I know we are in Ways and Means after dark and I apologize. I want to be slightly verbose. I want to say as a preliminary matter that our concern is not just about having a study. It is a study that leads to a predetermined outcome, and we want to make sure there are certain parameters in this study so that it produces objective results that are helpful to the state. The Nevada Bankers Association agrees with exploring accelerated tax collection but strongly believes that it would be fiscally responsible for the state to consider and compare multiple options using current data and estimated costs and benefits from all stakeholders, including the Department of Taxation, merchants, payment processors, and credit card issuers. More specifically, we believe that the following provisions should be included in a fiscally responsible feasibility study to identify the most beneficial path for the state.

These are the provisions that we would ideally like to have in this bill as part of this study. First, the study must compare actual results from states currently using any real-time system as well as compare results from states using prepayment scenarios and any other solutions. Second, claims of benefits to the state must be compared to the benefit from other methods or systems that advance tax collection revenue. Third, estimated cost to the state merchants, payment processors, and credit card issuers to create, implement, train, and maintain any new system must be calculated from data gathered directly from the stakeholder community located in the state as well as providing products and services to customers located in the state of Nevada. Fourth, study of a system or process must evaluate the percentage of a merchant's transactions that will be facilitated by the system or process and costs related to implementing and maintaining multiple channels of reporting and payment. And fifth, any data reports or estimates set forth must be from reports created no longer than five years prior to the feasibility study.

We fear that if the aforementioned parameters are not expressly included in Senate Bill 465, the result will likely be a system that has been dismissed as unfeasible in a number of states, including Massachusetts, Connecticut, Arizona, Missouri, and California. Perhaps more concerning, Nevada might find itself attempting to implement a system with insurmountable challenges and costs for retailers, payment processors, and credit card issuers. As a result, unless we are able to amend this bill, we would urge your opposition to Senate Bill 465.

Brian Reeder, representing Nevada Credit Union League:

The credit unions share the same concerns brought up by Connor Cain and the Nevada Bankers Association.

Dylan Keith, Assistant Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

On behalf of our over 4,000 members, 80 percent of whom are small businesses, we are in opposition today. According to the Retailers Association of Massachusetts, 8 percent of sales are returned, and up to 30 percent of online sales are returned. We believe that this would actually cost the state dollars, as these taxes would have to be returned to those merchants. The National Conference of State Legislatures has stated that the real-time sales tax process is not a solution. This is not what we are looking for when we are asking for the removal of red tape or the streamlining of services. We appreciate the effort and the thought of this effort. However, we request that you oppose this legislation.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I believe Assemblywoman Anderson has a question.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

My question was for Mr. Cain, but you are more than welcome to stay up here if you want and maybe you can answer it. Mr. Cain, you had specified the use of current data. Where would that current data come from? Would it come from the current banking area or would that come from outside vendors? At the beginning of your opposition, you stated use of current data, and I was wondering where exactly you expected that information to come from?

Connor Cain:

Thank you for the question. I think that current data would come from the stakeholders in the state of Nevada. It would come from the retailers, merchants, payment processors, and others who would be involved. The reason we want the data to be current relates to cost. If you are looking at data that is 20 or 30 years old, you do not have a good grasp on the cost of implementing a system like this—or the benefits—for that matter.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Would that also include the data around online sales and how that is being utilized as was mentioned in, I believe it was, the Massachusetts area?

Connor Cain:

I do not know the answer to that question, but I am happy to ask and try to get an answer for you.

Patrick J. Reynolds, Senior Tax Counsel, Council on State Taxation:

With respect to this concept of so-called real-time sales tax collection, it is a topic that we have been following for over a decade. There have been several proposals in several different states, and as mentioned, most recently in Massachusetts. What it invariably involves is huge costs to the business community, huge costs to the state, and little or no benefit to the state. I believe you heard earlier that the goal was to try to accelerate sales tax revenue. If that is the case, the best the state can hope for in terms of any sort of benefit is to, in the best-case scenario, accelerate 13 months of revenue into a 12-month period for the first year only. In subsequent years, you would have 12 months of revenue in a 12-month period. You simply have shifted the cadence. At the end of the day, this is something that represents huge costs for business and little or no benefit to the state. The only parties who would benefit from an arrangement like this are those who are trying to sell the idea and are trying to benefit financially from the additional complexities. We respectfully urge you to vote against Senate Bill 465, and we respectfully suggest it would be a huge waste of taxpayer money with over \$605,000 to study this issue.

There are several studies out there—Connecticut studied it; Massachusetts studied it. The research arm of the Council on State Taxation, the State Tax Research Institute has issued studies that showed, in the case of Massachusetts, it was going to cost businesses \$1.2 billion in upfront costs and an additional \$28 million in annual recurring costs to build the system for at best a one-month bump in revenue. That one-month bump in revenue, by the way, approximately 20 states have already figured out you can have that same acceleration of 13 months of revenue into a 12-month period by simply requiring an estimated prepayment. To be fair, that is not something that we advocate for, but it is absolutely a better option to get that acceleration than making the business community incur staggering amounts of cost to implement new systems. That is the reason it has failed in every other state in which it has been looked at or studied. We think that \$605,000 is a lot of money to spend on something that would ultimately end with the same conclusion. We respectfully request that you vote no on Senate Bill 465.

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

We are opposed to this bill, but I want to thank the Department of Taxation for their hard work and for recognizing that there might be a need to help some of our small retailers understand the rules or understand that money is certainly earmarked for the state, and they need to be prepared to pay that bill at the end of the month. We appreciate their trying to look at solutions to do that. We think an education plan or some sort of training for retailers might be more appropriate than this particular solution.

You have heard it referenced that the NCSL [National Conference of State Legislatures] has looked at this. I want to read directly from their conclusion which says that the proprietary, patented process being promoted as real-time sales tax collection raises significant challenges, creates additional burdens for both retailers and state tax administrators, and imposes new burdens on businesses not currently involved in the sales tax collection process and thus is not a process that their task force could recommend to the state. The internal compliance would be extremely difficult for all of our retailers. It is difficult to accurately calculate the sales tax collections midperiod due to delays created by processors and the volume of sales impacted by these delays. Returns and canceled payments further complicate the issue, and while our larger retailers would struggle to comply, our smaller retailers would be unable to absorb these costs or pass on those costs to their consumers, which would increase the likelihood that the number of retailers that we would have in Nevada would contract.

Currently, retailers do not have the need to share a lot of this data. We are very worried about how the system could look that would require us to talk to other folks or share purchasing data in order to differentiate taxable versus nontaxable sales. Again, there is no budget flexibility, or new budget flexibility, that would be provided in the system. There are no additional sales taxes that would be generated. Whereas there have been steps taken by the Legislature in the last several sessions to modernize the sales tax and those have greatly increased our sales tax collection, this bill would not lead to any increase in that, or any more budget flexibility. It is for those reasons that the Retail Association of Nevada strongly feels that there is a much more beneficial and more effective use for \$605,000 in other areas of the budget. We would strongly urge you to consider reallocating these dollars.

Emily Osterberg, Director, Government Affairs, Henderson Chamber of Commerce:

I represent the Henderson Chamber of Commerce and our over 1,800 members, most of whom are small businesses. For the reasons previously mentioned, we are also opposed to S.B. 465.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on Senate Bill 465? [There was no one.] We will ask if you have any closing comments.

Jennifer Roebuck:

I would like to reiterate that the Department's intent for this proposal was strictly budgetary in nature to fund an objective feasibility study. The Department intentionally refrained from

including parameters and criteria within the scope of the study to ensure objectivity in the third-party feasibility study, including unintended bias from the Department and specific industry sectors. Any effort to bring future legislation to implement such a program would involve significant stakeholder input, and that would be the appropriate time for industry to insert policy considerations. We anticipate that the third party would reach out to industry as part of that study, and our intention is to allow that process to occur. In addition, if the study results in our moving forward, industry will have an opportunity to weigh in at that point. I do not think information more than a few years old would make sense with the speed of technology, and based on the past, a fresh look is needed. We are very much looking forward toward the future. An indirect benefit that has not been mentioned yet is an increase in everyday customers' trust that the sales taxes that they pay to a retailer are going directly to the state to benefit their communities. We very much appreciate your support, or consideration, of Senate Bill 465.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 465 and open the hearing for Senate Bill 466.

Senate Bill 466: Makes an appropriation to the Department of Taxation for the costs of a contract with an information technology consultant to perform the backlog of updates to the Unified Tax System. (BDR S-1153)

Joseph Bernardy, Deputy Executive Director, Information Technology, Department of Taxation:

Senate Bill 466 is a one-shot appropriation of \$378,560 from the State General Fund for the cost of a contract with an information technology consultant to perform the backlog of updates to the Unified Tax System (UTS). The Department of Taxation's Information Technology Division supports all aspects of the Unified Tax System, including the information technology (IT) infrastructure, custom application development, production support and helpdesk. All changes, enhancements, bug fixes, and major initiatives to the UTS are performed by the Taxation IT Division personnel. Successful completion of these tasks is critical to maintain a stable, secure, and reliable information technology infrastructure to support the Department's mission of collecting and distributing revenues.

The Department of Taxation's IT Division maintains a list of backlog items that need to be addressed for the UTS to function and fulfill business needs. Each backlog item requires programming changes, IT infrastructure changes, or security fixes. Every odd year, legislation brings changes in statutes that consume the same IT resources. To implement the changes, IT places some of the projects on hold during the implementation period. This backlog is steadily increasing as we are unable to timely address those backlog items. This request is for the Information Technology Division to contract with Master Services Agreement (MSA) programmers to help work on the operations backlog. The MSA contractors are quicker and easier to hire than full-time-equivalent positions, as contracting agencies have a pool of candidates at the ready and MSA contractors provide more flexibility as we can hire for different skill sets as needed.

One more point I would like to make is that the Department of Taxation is currently undertaking a project to modernize the UTS system with a commercial off-the-shelf system, but full implementation of that system is still three to four years away. I am happy to stand for any questions the Committee may have.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenters? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 466? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to Senate Bill 466? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on Senate Bill 466? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 466, and I will open the work session for Senate Bill 466 and accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 466.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HAFEN, O'NEILL, AND
YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 489.

Senate Bill 489: Makes appropriations to the Department of Taxation for information technology projects and equipment, employee training and a money counter machine. (BDR S-1151)

Joseph Bernardy, Deputy Executive Director, Information Technology, Department of Taxation:

Senate Bill 489 is a one-shot appropriation of State General Funds for information technology products and equipment, employee training, and a money-counting machine. Section 1 provides funding of \$64,500 to modernize the Internet website platform for the Department. Section 2 provides funding of \$10,861 for the cost of employee training and attendance of conferences. Section 3 provides funding of \$33,329 for the replacement of a money-counting machine. Section 4 of the bill provides funding of \$562,600 for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. This will replace 50 computers in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and 182 computers in FY 2025 in line with the computer replacement policy. Section 5 provides funding of \$12,128 for the replacement of uninterruptible power supply equipment. Section 6 of the bill provides funding of \$586,066 for the replacement of an information technology backup system—also in line with state computer replacement policy. Section 7 provides funding of \$110,109 for licenses to upgrade computer operating systems. The total General Fund one-shot request is \$1,379,593. I am happy to stand for any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions on Senate Bill 489? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 489? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 489? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony on Senate Bill 489? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 489 and open the work session for Senate Bill 489 and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 468, which makes an appropriation to the State Department of Agriculture for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software and deferred maintenance projects.

Senate Bill 468: Makes appropriations to the State Department of Agriculture for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software and deferred maintenance projects. (BDR S-1159)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Senate Bill 468 makes a State General Fund appropriation of \$12,260 to the Division of Animal Industry, State Department of Agriculture, for the replacement of computer hardware and software. In addition, it also provides \$192,478 to the Division of Administrative Services, State Department of Agriculture, for deferred maintenance projects.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions about Senate Bill 468? [There were none.] Is there anyone who wants to testify in support, opposition, or neutral to Senate Bill 468? [There was no one.] Because we are running out of time, I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 468 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 468.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

The speaker is going to be calling us back to floor, so we are going to hurry this up. The next bill on our agenda is Senate Bill 470.

Senate Bill 470: Makes appropriations to the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for deferred maintenance projects. (BDR S-1170)

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

After several lean years and legislative sessions, unfortunately a lot of things need to be fixed. This bill pertains to deferred maintenance for the Division of State Parks, the Division of Forestry, and the Forestry Conservation Camps. We gladly stand for questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, do you have any questions on Senate Bill 470? [There were none.] Thank you so much for the presentation. Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 470? [There was no one.] Are there any closing comments from the presenter? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 470, open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 470.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN JAUREGUI, O'NEILL, AND YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

The next bill on our agenda is Senate Bill 471.

Senate Bill 471: Makes an appropriation to the Division of State Parks of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for a visitor center at the Valley of Fire State Park. (BDR S-1171)

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

Senate Bill 471 deals with the next tranche of money in order to progress on the Valley of Fire State Park, which you are more familiar with than I am. I am looking forward to actually getting down there and seeing it. The development stage of engineering is almost

done, and this is for the first section of actually starting to put this to work for one of our busiest state parks. In overall numbers, I think Valley of Fire is far busier than Sand Harbor, but Sand Harbor does it in a three-month period. We gladly stand for questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenter? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 471? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 471, open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 471.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

The next item on our agenda is Senate Bill 472.

Senate Bill 472: Makes an appropriation to the Division of Water Resources of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for projects at the South Fork Dam. (BDR S-1172)

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

What you have before you is a bill to provide funds to try to repair South Fork Dam, which is \$635,000 to work toward this. This is one of our two dam repair bills that we are bringing in front of you. I stand for questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions on Senate Bill 472? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral to Senate Bill 472? [There was no one.] As there are no closing comments from the presenter, I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 472, open the work session, and entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 472.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

The next item on our agenda is Senate Bill 473.

Senate Bill 473: Makes an appropriation to the Division of Water Resources of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for a study of extreme rainfall events. (BDR S-1173)

James A. Settlemeyer, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

This is our second bill dealing with dams. The State Engineer, Adam Sullivan, wishes to give a brief comment because it is his precipitation study, but it needs a small explanation.

Adam Sullivan, P.E., State Engineer and Administrator, Office of the State Engineer, Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

The extreme rainfall referred to here is the probable maximum precipitation, which is a critical engineering design standard for dams and spillways. The method currently used in Nevada is from 1977, but we now have the capability to update with a more accurate and precise methodology. Most Western states have already done this in recent years. Doing this study and updating the standard will provide engineers and dam owners with updated methods so we are not overbuilding dams, which is extremely expensive, or underbuilding, which is a risk to public safety. That is just a little more explanation of what this bill is about.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you, and with all of the melting snow and rain we had, we are definitely going to need this. Members, are there any questions for the presenters? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 473?

Tracy Bower, Director of External Affairs, Desert Research Institute:

The Desert Research Institute is in support of this study. Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition or neutral on Senate Bill 473? [There

was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 473 and open the work session and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 473.

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 apologize to the Treasurer's Office. You had two other bills, and I did not notice. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 486.

Senate Bill 486: Makes appropriations to the Nevada Promise Scholarship Account and the Millennium Scholarship Trust Fund. (BDR S-1123)

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

Senate Bill 486 makes an appropriation to the Nevada Promise Scholarship of \$6 million and an appropriation to the Governor Guinn Millennium Scholarship of \$75 million, which was included in the Governor's recommended budget. The only thing I would note is that this appropriation for the Millennium Scholarship would cover us through the upcoming biennium and the biennium following, so we would have some certainty in that program which is currently insolvent. I am happy to take any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 486?

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

We are in support of this bill. Thank you very much.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 486? [There was no one.] There are no closing comments from the presenter, so I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 486 and open the work session and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 486.

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 open the hearing for Senate Bill 499.

Senate Bill 499: Revises provisions governing expenditures from the Endowment Account established in the State General Fund related to the Nevada College Savings Program. (BDR 31-1190)

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

Senate Bill 499 is a budget implementation bill that is needed to change statutory language to implement some of the budget closings that were approved by the joint money committees. As I am sure you are well aware, you approved a number of positions for the Treasurer's Office. Two critically important positions were a deputy of financial security, who will oversee the Individual Development Account Program and some of our access to savings programs we have been working on over the last four years, and a program officer for our Able Savings Program, which is currently unstaffed. I do this by myself, and it helps people with disabilities save for a better future. The positions were proposed and closed by the money committees to be paid out of the College Savings Endowment. There is currently a 3 percent cap on that endowment, so that would be about \$179,000 for each year of the biennium to fund both of those positions and to allow for any potential salary increases that would be made by this legislative body, or any cost-of-living increases. We have worked with Fiscal Analysis Division staff, and we believe a 10 percent cap would suffice for a little growth in the program, and that is what we see in the bill. I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions on Senate Bill 499? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in support, opposition, or neutral to Senate Bill 499? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 499 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 499.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 477 and make apologies to our one and only person there in Las Vegas. I believe this is your bill. Is that correct?

Senate Bill 477: Makes various changes relating to the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs. (BDR 18-1066)

Brenda Scolari, Director, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs:

Senate Bill 477 represents a much-needed restructuring of the Department to better serve the work of the agencies within it. The bill addresses four main points: the first is the creation of a deputy of tourism position; the second is the creation of an administrative operations budget account; the third is the elimination of the ex officio nonvoting members of the Nevada Commission on Tourism; and the fourth is the integration of the Nevada Magazine staff into the Division of Tourism. Together these elements of the bill rectify many of the inefficiencies that resulted when the Department was originally formed in 2011—an action that created funding support for the cultural agencies but underserved the overall administrative and operational needs. That concludes my presentation, and I am here for questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenter?

Assemblywoman Peters:

I am looking at section 5—the deletion of the ex officio members. Can you tell us a little more about that?

Brenda Scolari:

The chairs of the cultural agencies of the Nevada Arts Council, the Division of Museums and History, and the Nevada Indian Commission, currently serve as nonvoting members on the Tourism Commission. Over time, we have had some absenteeism as a result and some complaints about the nonvoting status. The bill reflects the intent to just focus their representation on their own boards and commissions and then address any issues or challenges through the administration.

Assemblywoman Peters:

Generally, just a part of the restructuring of your Department.

Brenda Scolari:

Correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 477? [There was no one.] I will

close the hearing on Senate Bill 477 and open the work session, and I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 477.

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 open the hearing on Senate Bill 476.

Senate Bill 476: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Office of the Military for facilities maintenance projects and the replacement or purchase of certain equipment and computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1187)

Cheryl Tyler, Administrative Services Officer, Office of the Military:

Senate Bill 476 requests appropriations to fund facilities maintenance projects throughout the state for the Office of the Military National Guard facilities and purchase and replacement of facilities, equipment, and computer hardware and associated software. I am available to answer any questions that the Committee might have.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenter for Senate Bill 476? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral to Senate Bill 476? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 476 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 476.

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 open the hearing on Senate Bill 478.

Senate Bill 478: Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Office of the Secretary of State for an unanticipated shortfall related to credit card processing fees. (BDR S-1101)

Gabriel DiChiara, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State:

Senate Bill 478 would make an appropriation in the sum of \$426,376 to cover the agency shortfall related to credit card processing. We are presently moving away from the agency-paid model for processing credit card fees and hopefully will not need to request any supplemental funds to cover shortfalls related to this issue in the future. We are available for questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Do you have an anticipated date of when we will be off this system?

Gabriel DiChiara:

We are working as quickly as possible. We have a goal of July 1, 2023. I am not sure if that would be possible given the technical limitations, but absolutely as soon as possible.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions about Senate Bill 478? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 478? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 478 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 478.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI 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.)

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 483.

Senate Bill 483: Makes appropriations to the Office of the Secretary of State for the purchase and replacement of computer hardware and associated software and certain equipment. (BDR S-1118)

Gabriel DiChiara, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State:

Senate Bill 483 makes appropriations totaling \$365,652 to address regularly scheduled equipment replacement needs in departments across the agency focused on information technology. That concludes the presentation. I am available for questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions for the presenter? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral to Senate Bill 483? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 483 and will open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 483.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI 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.)

The next item on our agenda tonight will be Senate Bill 484.

Senate Bill 484: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Office of the Secretary of State for the costs of certain audits, voter education materials and outreach, signature verification services and certain systems. (BDR S-1120)

Gabriel DiChiara, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State:

Senate Bill 484 would make appropriations to address areas of elections administration that are sorely in need of resources. The largest ticket item relates to appropriating \$25 million from the State General Fund and \$5.5 million from the Help America Vote Act for the implementation of Assembly Bill 422 of the 81st Session and the transition to a statewide top-down voter registration database and election management system. Obviously, this is a very complex item with a lot of moving parts that I am happy to explain in detail, but I will let the Committee ask me those questions before I do so.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, do you have any questions on Senate Bill 484? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 484? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 484 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 484.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI 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.)

The next bill on our agenda is Senate Bill 485.

Senate Bill 485: Makes appropriations to the Office of the Secretary of State for costs related to the Office's business registration and filing system, Internet website and information security. (BDR S-1121)

Gabriel DiChiara, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State:

Senate Bill 485 would appropriate funds for the business registration and filing system for a total of \$16,524,652. I would just like to add for the record that today, for the period of less than an hour, SilverFlume was down. We still do not know why, and we hope to have an answer soon. We would really like to get these things fixed so it stops going down, and we can start having answers for why these things go down. We would greatly appreciate the Legislature's investment in the commercial recordings and business registration system. I am available for any questions. Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions regarding Senate Bill 485? [There were none.] Thank you so much for the presentation, and yes, we do need to fix that. Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 485? [There was no one.]

[Exhibit D was not discussed during the hearing but was submitted in support of Senate Bill 485 and will become part of the record.]

Gabriel DiChiara:

Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Committee. I would like to thank all of you for your dedication. I have not had this much fun after 9 p.m. since Lost was on ABC.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you. I will close the hearing for Senate Bill 485 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 485.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI 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.)

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 482.

Senate Bill 482: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Office of the Attorney General for the replacement of ballistic vests and for licenses to upgrade the computer operating system. (BDR S-1117)

Michael K. Morton, Special Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General:

Senate Bill 482 makes four appropriations to two budget accounts for license upgrades for Windows 11 and for ballistic vests. I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 482? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 482 and open the work session, and I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 482.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI 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.)

Next on our agenda is Senate Bill 488.

Senate Bill 488: Makes appropriations to the Peace Officers' Standards and Training Commission for the replacement of certain systems, furniture, vehicles and computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1142)

Christopher Carter, Deputy Director, Peace Officers' Standards and Training Commission:

Senate Bill 488 makes appropriations to the agency for the replacement of certain systems, furniture, vehicles, and computer hardware and associated software. I am happy to answer questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, do you have any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 488? [There was no

one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 488 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 488.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 491 and turn it over to our Fiscal staff.

Senate Bill 491: Revises provisions related to the Department of Business and Industry concerning information technology. (BDR S-1167)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Senate Bill 491 extends the reversion dates for an appropriation of \$693,670 approved by the Legislature during the 81st Session for the Real Estate Division to update the licensing system. This project is currently in progress, and this extends the reversion to June 30, 2025.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral to Senate Bill 491?

Sharath Chandra, Administrator, Real Estate Division, Department of Business and Industry:

I wanted to thank the Committee for taking the time to hear this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 491 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 491.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI 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.)

The next bill on our agenda is Senate Bill 493.

Senate Bill 493: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Department of Health and Human Services for the replacement or purchase of computer hardware and associated software, data lines and software licenses. (BDR S-1181)

Debi Reynolds, Deputy Director, Fiscal Services, Department of Health and Human Services:

I am here today to present Senate Bill 493, which makes appropriations and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Department of Health and Human Services for the replacement or purchase of computer hardware and associated software data lines and software licenses. I am happy to run through the numbers or answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The total State General Fund appropriation is \$84,175 and it authorizes an additional expenditure totaling \$33,727. Is that correct?

Debi Reynolds:

That is correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 493? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 493 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 493.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI 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.)

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 494.

Senate Bill 494: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy of the Department of Health and Human Services for the replacement or purchase of computer hardware and software, a certain database and a centralized credentialing process. (BDR S-1183)

Amber Law, Deputy Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services:

I am here today regarding Senate Bill 494 which is requesting appropriations for computer replacement, associated hardware and software costs, and also replacement of a database and implementation of a centralized credentialing process. I am here to answer any questions you may have.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral to Senate Bill 494? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 494 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI 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.)

The next item on our agenda is Senate Bill 497.

Senate Bill 497: Revises provisions relating to certain arbitrations concerning the cost of medically necessary emergency services. (BDR 40-1214)

Dena Schmidt, Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services:

Senate Bill 497 does one very simple thing. It allows the state agency to retain money paid by the out-of-network providers or third party in an arbitration. We currently charge for the arbitration, and this allows us to keep that revenue. I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral for Senate Bill 497? [There was no one.] I will

close the hearing on Senate Bill 497 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 497.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI 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.)

I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 500, which makes an appropriation to the Department of Education for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software.

Senate Bill 500: Makes appropriations to the Department of Education for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software. (BDR S-1156)

Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent, Student Investment Division, Department of Education:

Regarding Senate Bill 500, I do not think I can say it any better than you, Madam Chair. I will be available for any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral to Senate Bill 500? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 500 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 500.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI 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.)

We will open the hearing for Senate Bill 445.

Senate Bill 445: Revises provisions governing emergency medical services.
(BDR 40-1071)

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

The Emergency Medical Services program uses a software program called ImageTrend. We have had increasing difficulty funding ImageTrend with federal grants as we have historically, and we are asking to be able to use our fees. We also have State General Funds to fund ImageTrend and not to have that revert. We are happy to answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 445? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 445 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 445.

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 open the hearing for Senate Bill 448 and will turn it over to our Fiscal staff.

Senate Bill 448: Revises provisions governing the distribution of the proceeds of certain administrative assessments. (BDR 14-1092)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Senate Bill 448 eliminates the distribution of court administrative assessments to the Executive Branch and the Judicial Branch budgets collected pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* 176.059, and deposits the funds into the unrestricted State General Fund.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone who would like to provide testimony in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 448? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 448 and open the work session, and I will accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 448.

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 open the hearing for Senate Bill 449 and turn it over to our Fiscal staff.

Senate Bill 449: Revises provisions governing structured settlement purchase companies. (BDR 3-1074)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Senate Bill 449 grants authority to the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs within the Department of Business and Industry to adopt regulations for structured settlement purchase companies, modifies regulations for surety bonds for these companies, and establishes various nonrefundable fees.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions on Senate Bill 449? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support, opposition, or neutral on Senate Bill 449? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 449 and open the work session, and I will entertain a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 449.

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 open the work session for Assembly Bill 150 (1st Reprint) and turn it over to our Fiscal staff.

Assembly Bill 150 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the waiver of certain fees by the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada. (BDR 34-88)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 150 (1st Reprint) as amended removes the requirement to be a resident of the state for at least one year for certain students who are Native Americans, to be eligible for a waiver of tuition charges by the Board of Regents for the University of Nevada. The bill as amended requires a waiver to equal the full amount of registration fees and laboratory fees and any other mandatory fees assessed against the students for that semester, except if the student is enrolled in a course or program in the field other than health, social work, science,

technology, engineering, arts, and math. The bill as amended provides State General Fund appropriations of \$450,000 in each year of the 2023-2025 biennium to the Nevada System of Higher Education to defray the costs of the grant waiver. During the testimony, it was discussed how that amount came to fruition, and the Nevada System of Higher Education indicated that it was approximately the amount that they are currently waiving for other areas. They provided a specific amount on the record, which was \$457,449 per year. The sponsor of the bill has asked that be the amount placed in the bill. Should the Committee wish to entertain that change, the motion would be to amend and do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions on the amendment to the bill or the appropriations to add into the bill? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS
AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 150 (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 open the work session for Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint)

**Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint): Creates the Virtual Early Childhood Family
Engagement Pilot Program in the Department of Health and Human Services.
(BDR S-988)**

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 348 (1st Reprint) as amended establishes the virtual early childhood family engagement pilot program within the Department of Health and Human Services. I would note that there was discussion related to this bill that there was an original State General Fund appropriation of \$4 million in each year; however, the amendment accidentally took out that \$4 million each year. There was discussion during the hearing related to possibly providing an alternative amount, and I believe the discussion was for \$1 million in each year of the biennium to provide for this particular program. If the Committee wishes to entertain this, the motion would be to amend and do pass as amended.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass as amended.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED ASSEMBLY BILL 348 (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.)

We will open the work session for Assembly Bill 483.

Assembly Bill 483: Makes an appropriation to the Workforce Innovations for a New Nevada Account. (BDR S-1145)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Assembly Bill 483 appropriates \$20 million in State General Funds to the Workforce Innovations for a New Nevada Account. During the hearing, there was discussion as to the appropriateness of the dollar amount. There was an alternative amount that was discussed. I believe the Committee was considering changing the amount to \$5 million in each year of the biennium. If the Committee wishes to entertain that change, the motion would be to amend and do pass.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 483.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 483.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Hafen:

What is the amount we are talking about?

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

It would be \$5 million in each year of the biennium for a total of \$10 million.

Assemblyman Hafen:

I just want to know what is going on.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

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

I will open the meeting for public comment. [There was none.]

Meeting adjourned [at 10:19 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Anne Bowen
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 mock-up of a proposed amendment titled "Proposed Amendment 3744 to Senate Bill No. 440 First Reprint," dated May 29, 2023, submitted by Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6.

[Exhibit D](#) is a letter dated June 1, 2023, signed and submitted by Matthew Taylor, Executive Vice President, Nevada Registered Agent Association, in support of Senate Bill 485.