

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

**Eighty-Second Session
June 2, 2023**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 10:21 a.m. on Friday, June 2, 2023, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator James Ohrenschall, Senate District No. 21
Senator Skip Daly, Senate District No. 13
Senator Dina Neal, Senate District No. 4
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8
Senator Julie Pazina, Senate District No. 12



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Anna Freeman, Committee Secretary
Janet Osalvo, Committee Assistant
Bet Torres, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Stephen Wood, representing Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, City of Henderson
Chris Ferrari, representing BRINC Drones
Susan L. Fisher, representing the Nevada Aviation Association, and Crown Castle
Fran Almaraz, President, Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum
Mark A. Wlaschin, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State
Izack Tenorio, representing Campaign Legal Center
Noé Orosco, Program Manager, Let Nevadans Vote
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom
Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada
Barbara Jones, Private Citizen, Washoe County, Nevada
Alida Benson, Executive Director, Nevada Republican Party
Gabriel DiChiara, Chief Deputy Secretary of State, Office of the Secretary of State
Alexis Motarex, Government Affairs, Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors
Glen Leavitt, Director, Government Affairs, Nevada Contractors Association
Brian Reeder, representing Las Vegas Paving
Darian Z. Harris, Associate, Advantage Capital, New Orleans, Louisiana
Nick Vassiliadis, representing Advantage Capital Partners
Trevor Parrish, Manager, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Randy Robison, Director of Government and Community Affairs, City of Las Vegas
Terry Reynolds, Director, Department of Business and Industry
Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director, Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities; and Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Department of Motor Vehicles
Shane Piccinini, Co-President, Nevada Center for Civic Engagement
Christine Hull, Program Director, Nevada Center for Civic Engagement
Sheila Bray, Community Partnerships Coordinator for Clark County, Extension, University of Nevada, Reno
Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association
Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition
Jhone M. Ebert, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education
Megan Peterson, Deputy Superintendent, Student Investment Division, Department of Education

Ciara Byrne, Founder and Co-Chief Executive Officer, Green Our Planet
Marco Rauda, representing Green Our Planet
Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League
Andrew M. Belanger, Director, Public Services, Las Vegas Valley Water District
Tony Ramirez, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada
Janet Quintero, Vice President, External Affairs, United Way of Southern Nevada
Annette Dawson Owens, School Readiness Policy Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance of Nevada
Camila Rios, representing Three Square Food Bank
Lisa Ortega, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Linda Flaherty, Community Educator, Healthy Communities Coalition of Lyon and Storey Counties
Jim DeGraffenreid, National Committeeman, Nevada Republican Party
Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County
Stacie Weeks, Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services
Maggie Carlton, Executive Director, United Labor Agency of Nevada
Dan Musgrove, representing Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow
Zoë Houghton, representing United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra
Tom Clark, Board Member, Pioneer Center for the Performing Arts
Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Becky Harris, representing University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

[Roll was called. Rules and protocol were reviewed.] We will take the agenda out of order. The first two bills listed will be discussed later. We will begin with Senate Bill 11 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 11 (2nd Reprint): Requires the Department of Public Safety to adopt certain regulations relating to unmanned aerial vehicles. (BDR 44-370)

Stephen Wood, representing Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities:

Senate Bill 11 (2nd Reprint) is an important bill for the safety of local governments' building and fire inspectors. It is difficult sometimes for them to get on roofs to complete inspections that are important for public safety. It is important for property owners to be able to ensure that their buildings are safe for the public.

David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, City of Henderson:

The City of Henderson approached the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities with this concept, knowing that it would not only benefit Henderson but other cities, local governments, and public agencies across the state—all of which are subject to regulation by the Department of Public Safety (DPS) when it comes to the operation of drones.

Public agencies can only operate drones in ways authorized by the DPS. When we came up with this concept, we recognized that this was the way the statute was written. We asked the Legislature to please require that the DPS add this new use to its existing list of regulations for unmanned aerial vehicles used by public agencies. That was the part of the bill that was in its original form. We thought it was in keeping with the way that the statute was created in 2015: the DPS would use its existing authority to add this use to a list that contains approximately 16 other authorized uses. We found out after the fact that there was a change in the way the DPS had been organized. While authority stayed with the DPS, the operation, regulations, and promulgation went over to the Division of Emergency Management. That is why we ended up with the fiscal note that we are here to discuss today.

Chris Ferrari, representing BRINC Drones:

When the cities were looking at this bill, the issue they wanted to address was national security; that has already been addressed in the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure. The agencies also want to be compliant with the National Defense Authorization Act, Section 889, ensuring that they are not purchasing products manufactured by entities identified as enemies of America. This is an amendment regarding national security and was introduced during the policy committee.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone here who can address the fiscal note from the Nevada Highway Patrol of \$374,343 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$241,262 in FY 2025?

David Cherry:

I would like to share with the Committee what we have come to understand about the fiscal note. In 2021, a reorganization in the Executive Branch moved the Division of Emergency Management under the Office of the Military. The DPS still has statutory authority to regulate unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), but there is no staff left at the DPS doing this job now. The Department came forward to ask for two staff members and some equipment—a database necessary for this regulation.

One of the reasons we feel that the Committee should look favorably upon this request is because it is clear to us that the statutory authority is at the DPS. It has always been at the DPS. We were not asking them to do something new in this bill; they were already required to regulate UAVs and maintain a registry. The authority has been given to the DPS since 2015, and the regulatory requirement is on the DPS.

The last sentence of this fiscal note says that the Highway Patrol would require funding to replace current UAV equipment. The bill was amended to reflect that any equipment already in the possession of local government—or any public agency governed under this section of *Nevada Revised Statutes*—would be able to continue to use that. We would not have to replace existing drones. The requirement to purchase from the list of authorized drone providers would only go into effect for new purchases. That part of the fiscal note is no longer valid.

Stephen Wood:

The request is relatively simple in the regulations for the DPS. We are asking for two additional uses in what is already a long list of uses for local governments to use drones. Mr. Ferrari is asking for a citation of federal law to be added to the regulations.

Assemblyman Watts:

This statutory charge of regulating UAVs was always set with the DPS. The Department basically passed that on at their own discretion, putting that workload on the Division of Emergency Management (DEM). However, nothing in statute put it on the DEM. The DEM then moved to the Office of the Military, so the DPS wanted to transfer that program over as well because they no longer had anyone within the DPS to run this program.

Again, this was a discussion in the policy committee, but there are concerns about having this program in the Office of the Military, including the fact that the Office of the Military does not follow the Administrative Procedure Act.

As it stands under current law, even with the DEM moving out of the DPS, the responsibility for this program sits with the DPS. They should continue to administer this program. Because the DEM is no longer within the DPS, the DPS must identify other staff—or another entity within the Department—to carry this out. It has always been the statutory charge of the DPS, correct?

Stephen Wood:

That is correct.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Has there been any discussion about training, especially with the collective bargaining units that are part of these entities?

Stephen Wood:

When local governments operate drones—when anybody operates them—they must comply with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations. There are training and licensing requirements as part of that. We comply with all those regulations currently and will continue to do so.

David Cherry:

Just so everybody understands: We are not looking to replace inspectors with drones. Inspectors could receive training to become operators or they could be accompanied by a drone operator.

Mr. Wood is correct that the drone operators must comply with FAA regulations. On the form that public agencies submit to the DPS stating that we operate a drone, it is required that we check the box signifying that we have the FAA certification for this activity.

In the policy committee, we were asked to check with our collective bargaining units to see if they had any concerns. They do not have concerns. They stated that their workforce will be trained and that this could be an enhancement to their ability to provide services.

Assemblyman Hafen:

Assemblyman Watts addressed my question. I did not see the reason for a fiscal note since the DPS is already required to do this. The language in this bill puts safeguards in for the public so that these are not being abused. I also appreciate bringing in the language for compliance with the federal government. I see the importance of this bill. I want to thank Assemblyman Watts for the explanation of the fiscal note, which I would agree is not necessarily needed.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 11 (R2)?

Susan L. Fisher, representing the Nevada Aviation Association, and Crown Castle:

I am representing the Nevada Aviation Association and Crown Castle. Crown Castle's affiliate company provides drones and drone software to local governments so that they can do the sort of work in this bill. We are in full support.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 11 (R2)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 11 (R2)? [There was no one.]

We will move on to Senate Bill 45 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 45 (1st Reprint): Establishes the amount for the personal needs allowance provided to certain recipients of Medicaid. (BDR 38-295)

Fran Almaraz, President, Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum:

I represent Senate District No. 10 on the Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum. I am pleased to present Senate Bill 45 (1st Reprint), which would increase the monthly personal allowance for certain Medicaid recipients residing in skilled nursing facilities so that it would be equal to the amount for Medicaid waiver recipients living in group home settings.

I have included a template letter which the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services (DWSS), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), sent to group home operators in Nevada last fall informing them of the increase in Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments for 2023 [[Exhibit C](#)].

The Nevada Silver Haired Legislative Forum was created in 1997 to identify and act upon issues of importance to aging persons. It is composed of up to 21 members, 60 years of age or older, nominated by state senators for appointment by the Legislative Commission. The forum may submit one bill draft request each regular legislative session. During a DHHS presentation last year, members learned that there are two care options for long-term

services and supports for certain Medicaid recipients—seniors in institutional care and those receiving home and community-based services. We also learned the Social Security Act provides for personal needs allowance (PNA) for Medicaid recipients residing in nursing facilities and group home settings. If a Medicaid recipient is living in either of these settings, the Social Security Act requires an allowance to be deducted from their monthly income to reserve some funds to cover costs of care not reimbursed by Medicaid. The rest of their monthly income goes to the nursing facility or group home for room and board.

These Medicaid recipients depend on the PNA for items such as clothing, grooming needs, toiletries, snacks, writing utensils, essential personal items, and other incidentals. Federal law sets the minimum monthly PNA at \$30. However, states can allow higher monthly PNA than the required federal minimum. In Nevada, seniors receiving Medicaid and living in nursing facilities or group home settings receive PNAs at differing rates—\$35 and \$149, respectively. Overall, the difference in the PNA between Medicaid nursing facility residents and Medicaid home and community-based services clients in group homes is currently \$114 monthly. In other words, a senior living in a group home receives an allowance over four times higher than a senior residing in a nursing home.

Based on information provided by DWSS, the PNA rate for residents of nursing facilities has not changed since 1991. Nevada is one of seven states that have maintained PNA rates of less than \$40. For example, this means seniors residing in a nursing home must save their PNA for several months to replace basic clothing items. This issue has only worsened with inflation increasing the cost of everyday items over the last 32 years.

In contrast, seniors living in group homes and receiving Medicaid home and community-based waiver services had the PNA annually increased based on the annual Social Security Administration's cost-of-living adjustment (COLA). Beginning in January 2023, these waiver recipients received a total SSI payment of \$1,305 monthly: a federal payment of \$914 and a supplemental state payment of \$391. Waiver recipients may keep an allowance of \$149; the remaining \$1,156 goes to the group home operator to cover the cost of room and board. The PNA increased proportionately with the COLA adjustment. For instance, the COLA for 2023 increased for these group home residents by 8.7 percent, from \$137 to \$149.

Senate Bill 45 (R1) would fix the discrepancy of significantly different allowances based on what kind of long-term care setting a person in this state resides. Page 2, Section 1, subsection 1 requires the Director of DHHS to include in the State Plan for Medicaid, that monthly PNA for Medicaid recipients residing in a skilled nursing facility must be no less than the monthly PNA provided to Medicaid waiver recipients living in a group setting.

Increasing the PNA from \$35 to \$149 for Medicaid recipients would also impact the recipient share of the nursing facility stay. If the PNA increases, the recipient share decreases. This means that the cost covered by Nevada Medicaid would increase by \$114 per recipient. Senate Bill 45 (R1) was amended on the Senate side with an appropriation from the State General Fund to Nevada Medicaid for the estimated cost of increasing the monthly PNA.

Over the 2023-2025 biennium the appropriation is \$945,000 from the State General Fund and \$2.9 million from federal funds. I would like to highlight the actual cost from the General Fund is less than \$1 million for the upcoming biennium. This is because the Federal Medicaid Assistance Percentage would cover most of these cost increases.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The appropriations were added to the legislation in amendment 756. Are there any questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.]

Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 45 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 45 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 45 (R1)? [There was no one.]

We will close the hearing on S.B. 45 (R1) and open the work session for this bill.

Senate Bill 45 (1st Reprint): Establishes the amount for the personal needs allowance provided to certain recipients of Medicaid. (BDR 38-295)

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 45 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

We will move on to the hearing on Senate Bill 54 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 54 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-409)

Senator James Ohrenschall, Senate District No. 21:

Senate Bill 54 (2nd Reprint) came out of the Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections, and has to do with our state's top elections officer—the Secretary of State—and promulgating an elections procedures manual that will be a guide for county clerks and registrars.

At our hearing on the Senate side, we had testimony that of the 17 clerks and registrars in the state, only 7 were in office in 2020. We have a lot of new people in these important positions. This manual, if it passes into law, will help provide uniformity and consistency in election procedures throughout the state.

Mark A. Wlaschin, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State:

The fiscal note is focused on two elements of the bill. The first is the creation of an elections procedures manual. We have an initial version in development already. It is approximately 500 pages, and is modeled after elections procedures manuals that exist in other states across the country. The fiscal note specifically calls for the printing. During odd-numbered years, we anticipate having more individuals in attendance at the training event, necessitating printing of 50 copies of the book with an additional 20 in the following years. This would be a public document; a PDF [portable document format] would also be available on the Secretary of State website so that members of the public could review this document and use it to answer their questions as well. That would be made free to the public.

The other element of the fiscal note is for travel, per diem, and a conference to conduct this training event on an annual basis. There is not a specific fiscal requirement in the bill because we have requested reimbursement of funding through the Reserve for Statutory Contingency Account through the State Board of Examiners. That will also enable us to continue to review and identify efficient means to have a conference. We are looking for the most cost savings that we can identify to preserve taxpayer dollars while finding the means to provide this essential training to our clerks and election officials across the state.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Was the appropriation amended into the bill with amendment 757?

Mark Wlaschin:

Yes.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 54 (R2)?

Izack Tenorio, representing Campaign Legal Center:

We urge you to support S.B. 54 (R2). It will ensure better education in democracy in Nevada. We urge you to support this bill.

Noé Orosco, Program Manager, Let Nevadans Vote:

On behalf of the Let Nevadans Vote coalition, I am here to express our support for S.B. 54 (R2). As stated by Senator Ohrenschall, out of the 17 clerks only 7 were here during the 2020 election. This loss of institutional knowledge is unfortunate and underscores the importance of having the elections procedures manual updated every two years instead of every ten years. The manual will not only benefit city and county clerks, but also Nevada voters. It will be accessible to the public. By implementing this provision, we can help guarantee that all city and county clerks receive adequate training and are equipped with the necessary knowledge and resources to carry out their duties effectively. We urge you to support this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 54 (R2)?

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:

We are pleased with some of the amendments to this bill, particularly the one that Senator Daly brought, which requires public oversight through the Legislative Commission. Originally there was no oversight. That is important in elections; we want transparency and we want people involved in the process, so we appreciate that.

We are concerned with the overall idea that it is all top-down now. We want to make sure that the autonomy of our local county clerks—who are elected by their local constituents—is maintained.

There is one thing I did not see in the bill—maybe I missed it. I hope the Secretary of State will be conferring with the county clerks before they finish the manual and before they do the training so that the concerns and issues of county clerks can be addressed by the manual. That is important because we have them as elected officials, and they should have something to say about what exactly is in the manual. So, we asked for that. We continue to have the concern that this is all top-down and for maintaining the autonomy of our local county clerks.

Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada:

We are thankful to Senator Daly. He was on top of it and brought a good amendment to this bill. We are still a little concerned. We want to keep the process going with people involved like county clerks, registrars, and the public. We want to keep them all involved in all of this. Thank you for the amendment, Senator Daly.

Barbara Jones, Private Citizen, Washoe County, Nevada:

I am so adamant about this bill, and I have done more research in this session. You have a historic decision to make—bigger than I think you realized for this state now and in the future. This is really top-down—more than you can realize. Uniformity, ease, and convenience are not always the best things. Our local elections need to be protected. This bill is the main implementation of the Voter Registration and Election Management Solution (VREMS) Project, which gives the Secretary of State the power—it is right here. Each county clerk and city clerk is required to comply with the procedures set forth in the most current version of the elections procedures manual. This is the third stage of implementation of the VREMS Project.

The consulting firm Gartner was national. I researched international, I researched CEOs, the vendor [unintelligible]—all international connections. Right now in the first two phases, they have spent over \$400,000. The information, not just in this bill, some others that you have already passed is \$30 million this year total. It is all on the Secretary of State website. The international connections are unbelievable. I do not care if it is Democrat, Republican, Independent, Green, whatever, and I do not care who the Secretary of State is. If you lose your local control to international and national people, we are in big danger. Please, I do not care what party, please stop this manual. The oversight is good, but it is not good enough

every not less than four years. You do not know who is on the committee. You do not know what oversight is going to be included, and it is still a big no on S.B. 54 (R2).

Alida Benson, Executive Director, Nevada Republican Party:

I am testifying in opposition to S.B. 54 (R2) on behalf of the Nevada Republican Party. This bill is an attack on local control. Local control is regularly invoked when defending irregular election practices in Clark County, such as excluding poll observers, not following publicly posted schedules, or refusing to allow cameras to livestream the ballot-counting process to the public as other counties in Nevada do. The importance of local control over elections was used as a reason to not address each of these real-life issues.

Senate Bill 54 (2nd Reprint) attacks the right of voters to determine what kind of election system they find trustworthy. Nevada counties, like our residents, are diverse and varied. The system for Esmeralda County with 617 registered voters can—and perhaps should—be radically different from Clark County with over 1.3 million active voters. That is not for an unaccountable commission to decide behind closed doors. It is for the voters in each county to decide. Senate Bill 54 (2nd Reprint) attempts to disenfranchise rural voters by preventing them from directing their local county representatives to implement a voting system that they find most fair and responsive to their needs. This bill is an improper attempt to circumvent procedures for issuing new regulations that require public comment and participation by the *Nevada Administrative Code*. Open meetings and a strict adherence to open meeting laws are the hallmark of transparent government. An arbitrary Secretary of State guidebook, attempting to impose Clark County election rules statewide, is an attempt to subvert the authority of county commissioners and county clerks to decide their county-specific election procedures—authority which should be protected by the Democrat-sponsored Voters' Bill of Rights. For these reasons, we request that you please vote no on S.B. 54 (R2).

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 54 (R2)? [There was no one.] Does the presenter have any closing comments?

Senator Ohrenschall:

I will briefly address some of the concerns from the opposition. There was testimony on the Senate side that the Secretary of State has phone calls with all 17 clerks twice per month, so I am confident there will be input from all clerks and registrars in creating this manual. Senator Daly's amendment also includes oversight by the Legislative Commission.

Regarding the content of the manual, I would point the Committee to section 2, subsection 4 on page 2 of the bill. Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary of State to include any provision in the elections procedures manual that amends or conflicts with any provision of state or federal laws or regulations. In subsection 2, there is the requirement that the elections procedures manual comply with Title 24, the *Nevada Revised Statutes* regarding election law, and all Secretary of State regulations regarding elections.

With your indulgence, Chair, I ask that Chief Deputy Secretary of State DiChiara make brief closing comments as well.

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

Assembly Bill 422 of the 81st Session required the state to move to a top-down voter registration and election management system. That is what we are in the process of doing now. This is going to be a new system for all Nevada counties. They are working with us closely now in the implementation. Their staff will need instruction on how everything works.

This manual is not intended to be the Secretary of State dictating how the county clerks do their jobs. This manual is intended to be a tool for them to be able to meet all the needs that they are required—by statute and regulation—to follow closely.

[Assemblywoman Backus assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Backus:

With that, we will close the hearing on S.B. 54 (R2) and open its work session.

Senate Bill 54 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-409)

Vice Chair Backus:

I would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 54 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Hafen:

Based on the public testimony, I want to look at the policy more. Being that the fiscal impact is minor, I will vote this out of the Committee. However, I will reserve the right to change my vote on the floor.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I have emailed the registrar in Carson City and the Storey County Clerk to get their take on this. Because the concern is not monetary—it is policy—and this is the money committee, I will vote yes with a reservation.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

Ditto.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMEN JAUREGUI, MONROE-MORENO, AND YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Vice Chair Backus:

I will assign the floor statement to Chair Monroe-Moreno. We will move on to the hearing for Senate Bill 82 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 82 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions related to public works. (BDR 28-535)

Senator Skip Daly, Senate District No. 13:

Senate Bill 82 (2nd Reprint) updates the Apprentice Utilization Act with the goal to have more apprentices utilized. A lot of it remains the same, but it switches the current process from a job-by-job request to an annual process. It takes the awarding bodies out of the enforcement and puts that responsibility on the Office of Labor Commissioner.

Under the current system, there could be a multimillion-dollar high school under construction for 18 months. If they call in for an apprentice and there is not one available that day, they would receive a waiver for the entire job. Under this system, they would have to try to meet that goal annually. They would have an ongoing obligation to call at least once every 30 days to see if there is another apprentice to try to utilize apprentices for the job.

The fiscal note from the Office of Labor Commissioner was reduced to \$376,876. The bill would go into effect January 1, 2024, so these new provisions would be in effect for that entire year. Then the contractor would have an annual report to include with the form from the Labor Commissioner, stating whether they met the utilization goal. That is where the fiscal note comes in. We anticipate additional work for the Office to review those reports and file complaints. The Labor Commissioner could initiate complaints and could receive complaints from unions and whoever else might be looking into that.

There is a time limit—75 days to make those complaints. We did not want to leave it open-ended and have it go on for years, so there is a time limit there. That will be a focus of the Office of Labor Commissioner's work from February 15 to May 1 of each year. We are hoping that this can either be funded or done through a work program in the interim, but it would not come to fruition until February 15, 2025.

Vice Chair Backus:

The cost was not appropriated within the bill on the Senate side, so the fiscal note remains.

Senator Daly:

I do not believe we received the fiscal note until it came to the Assembly side. There was no fiscal note included initially. We spoke with stakeholders, including the Labor Commissioner, along the way. After the bill passed out of the Senate, upon further examination a fiscal note was submitted.

We reached back out to the Office of Labor Commissioner, stating there would not be appropriations approved for the first year. There is no fiscal impact anticipated in fiscal year (FY) 2024. The first report is due in February 2025, so we were able to reduce the previous fiscal note, but that staff will be used. I am hoping that it can either be funded or you can do an interim work program, whichever way it goes. The bill is important and will affect the enforcement mechanisms to increase utilization of apprentices, which is the goal.

Vice Chair Backus:

The most recent fiscal note is dated May 26, 2023, and is for \$376,876 in FY 2025, which seems to comport with the timeline that we are talking about, correct?

Senator Daly:

Yes, that is the most recent fiscal note. It was double that before. We told the Office of Labor Commissioner there was nothing for the first half of the biennium. We were able to get the fiscal note reduced. We are all working on the same goal; we just need to figure out how to make sure that the funding gets there.

Vice Chair Backus:

Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in support of S.B. 82 (R2)?

Alexis Motarex, Government Affairs, Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors:

The Nevada Chapter of the Associated General Contractors represents both signatory and open-shop construction companies in northern Nevada. We are here in support of S.B. 82 (R2). Senator Daly has worked for months with stakeholders to improve the Apprenticeship Utilization Act (AUA). We appreciate how hard he has worked to get this bill from where it started to where it is today. While this bill will place more administrative burden on the Labor Commissioner, it relieves each individual public owner in this state, including the State Public Works Division and the Nevada System of Higher Education, from monitoring and enforcing the provisions of the existing AUA, and requesting waivers from the Labor Commissioner on behalf of their contractors on each of their projects. This frees up those valuable resources for other benefits.

The stakeholders involved in this legislation, including the Office of Labor Commissioner, have been working in good faith for months to make the AUA easier to comply with while maintaining the fundamental purpose to require the use of apprentices on public works projects so they get the real-world, hands-on work experience. We urge your approval of this funding.

Glen Leavitt, Director, Government Affairs, Nevada Contractors Association:

The Nevada Contractors Association represents over 450 contractors and industry affiliates primarily in southern Nevada. The Nevada Contractors Association is in support of S.B. 82 (R2) as it is an improvement on the provisions currently in the AUA. We encourage your support of this measure.

Brian Reeder, representing Las Vegas Paving:

I am speaking on behalf of Las Vegas Paving. Bill Wellman could not be here this morning, so I am providing testimony on his behalf. He has been working on this issue since 2011. This bill helps to capture the intent of the bill that passed in 2019 authorizing the AUA to get more apprentices on jobsites. The current process is cumbersome. It is a waiver process that is per-job, per-entity, and it ends up leading to less ability for contractors to get apprentices on their jobsites. This gives the contractor more control so they can put apprentices on the jobsite when and where it is appropriate. It came out of the policy committee unanimously. We urge your support.

Vice Chair Backus:

Is there anyone else wishing to provide testimony in support of S.B. 82 (R2)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in opposition to S.B. 82 (R2)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 82 (R2)? [There was no one.]

[Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 82 (R2) and we will take a short recess.

[The Committee recessed at 11:17 a.m. and reconvened at 11:21 a.m.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will call the meeting back to order, and we will move on to Senate Bill 240 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 240 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the Nevada New Markets Jobs Act. (BDR 18-792)

Senator Dina Neal, Senate District No. 4:

Senate Bill 240 (2nd Reprint) is the Nevada New Markets Job Act. It has been around since 2013 and was reauthorized in 2019. This version extends the program and certifies an additional \$170 million in qualified equity investment under the Nevada New Markets Job Act. The tax credits are earned against the insurance premium tax, but they may not be taken until July 1, 2026.

The bill also has \$30 million in impact-qualified equity investments to qualified active low-income community businesses, as specified in the bill, on or after July 1, 2024. No credit may be taken until July 1, 2026.

The fiscal note is for a State General Fund appropriation of \$103,135 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$99,665 in FY 2025 for the Department of Business and Industry to carry out the provisions of this bill. The majority of the additional costs—even though this has been a program—is because of the \$30 million impact equity investment program, which is new.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Were the fiscal impacts amended into the bill on the Senate side?

Senator Neal:

Yes, they were.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in support of S.B. 240 (R2)?

Darian Z. Harris, Associate, Advantage Capital, New Orleans, Louisiana:

Advantage Capital is one of the original community development entities to participate in the New Markets Jobs Act when it was enacted in 2013. We continued to participate through its renewal in 2019. I urge your support for this bill.

Nick Vassiliadis, representing Advantage Capital Partners:

I know this is the money committee, but this was something that several of you voted to reauthorize in 2019. I would like to provide a brief overview of what has come from that. The Department of Business and Industry does a look-back study on these. A few of the key points on this look-back study are important because that was the entire intent of the bill—to hit statewide. Businesses in Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Silver Springs, Sparks, Reno, and Elko all receive funds from this.

There is also a specific effort to make sure that this hits severely distressed areas per the census. Over 50 percent of the employees are women or people of color. You are also seeing a return on investment; for every \$1 the state spends, there is about \$10 in return. You are also seeing an average of about a \$25 hourly salary for employees who work at businesses receiving these funds. It is also important to note that from 2003 to 2012, the state was receiving about \$220,000 per year in federal matching dollars when this program was put into place. We are now receiving \$39 million per year from the federal government matching these types of investments. I urge the Committee's support.

Trevor Parrish, Manager, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

The Vegas Chamber is in support of this bill, the financial provisions provided with it, and certainly the economic benefits that we will see from the bill. With that, we urge your support.

Randy Robison, Director, Government and Community Affairs, City of Las Vegas:

I am in support of S.B. 240 (R2). This is a program that we have taken advantage of in the City of Las Vegas. We also want to thank Senator Neal for advocating for these issues; we appreciate your continued advocacy. Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 240 (R2)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 240 (R2)?

Terry Reynolds, Director, Department of Business and Industry:

I have been involved in this program since its inception in 2013. I conducted the first hearing with committee development entities on regulations for this program. I am here to answer any questions you may have regarding the fiscal note.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Because the fiscal note was taken care of on the Senate side and included in the bill itself, I think that we are good with it. Are there any questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.]

We will close the hearing on S.B. 240 (R2) and open the work session on S.B. 240 (R2).

Senate Bill 240 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the Nevada New Markets Jobs Act. (BDR 18-792)

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 240 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 362 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 362 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public safety. (BDR 15-289)

Senator Dina Neal, Senate District No. 4:

There is a driver's license provision in Senate Bill 362 (2nd Reprint) that allows for a symbol to be applied for medical conditions. Citizens may decide if they want to put something on their licenses—such as epilepsy or a mental health condition—to inform a peace officer who may stop those individuals. The medical symbol on the driver's license or ID card gives information to allow that stop to happen appropriately if there were a situation. The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) put a fiscal note of \$127,000 on this because they are currently in the process of a transformation effort with their system. The bill becomes effective on October 1, 2023, for the regulations, and then administrative tasks and all other purposes on January 1, 2024. The DMV asked me to extend the deadline so that they can have the new system in place to roll this in.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

This Committee has had DMV representatives in for several bills, and by pushing out the deadline, they were able to remove the fiscal notes. Did they make that offer to you?

Senator Neal:

No, they did not.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Let us reach out to the DMV to see if we can get that same offer. I do not see an amended fiscal note.

Assemblyman Miller:

On a bill on which I was working, we were able to push the date out to 2026. That was what was able to remove the fiscal note because they would be able to do it in the update. For S.B. 362 (R2), if the date were pushed out to 2026—with the expectation that the DMV would get it done as soon as possible—would moving the date pose a problem for the bill?

Senator Neal:

No. I need to make sure that it only applies to that portion of the provisions, but I thought that they were going to start system implementation by the end of 2024.

Assemblyman Miller:

With my bill, there was an understanding that the DMV would likely implement sooner, but 2026 was the deadline in case there were issues. The DMV expected to be able to implement much sooner than that.

Senator Neal:

I am okay with pushing the date out. I just need to make sure that it does not affect the first portion of the bill, which relates to peace officer training around intellectual property. That is fine with me if it is there. It is a safekeeping measure to ensure that people with health conditions can give peace officers more knowledge regarding a citizen they may encounter.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

I am looking for clarification between the two bills. We have the bill from Assemblyman Miller and this bill as well. Would these be two different symbols on the driver's license, or are they going to end up being the same symbol? I believe one was for communication impairments and this is for health, but I am curious how those will work together.

Senator Neal:

I have a symbol design. It is a play on the AMA [American Medical Association] symbol; it is an "N" with a serpent coming through the center. The idea is that there could be some conformance—that it would be similar. Assemblyman Miller has a bill specifically on this. I brought S.B. 362 (R2) because we have silent diseases that are not necessarily on the surface. We have had a lot of stories nationally where a person with sickle cell disease may

be running and have a sickle cell experience that causes asphyxiation. This would indicate to medical services. That is also in the bill.

When the Legislative Counsel Bureau sees where there is conflict and where there is conformity, they make that match.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

It could possibly be two different symbols, correct?

Senator Neal:

There is no plan for two different symbols. I would like the symbol I created to be adopted, but a symbol cannot be legislated. I tried to give an example of what would be an appropriate indicator.

This bill is updating law in existence since 2007. Currently, the law has a code that makes it hard to decipher. I want to simplify it so that it would be a symbol on the identification.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

I like the idea; I was just wondering how they work together.

Senator Neal:

They should complement each other. It makes sense to have one symbol.

Assemblyman Miller:

They should complement each other. However, one does not necessarily mean the other thing. One indicates a specific health issue; the other indicates a specific communication need. You may have a communication need that is not a health issue.

Either way, what we are doing is the work to make sure that law enforcement has what they need when approaching an individual to know if they are going to need additional attention, or how to approach them. Whether it is two symbols or one symbol, they work together and will hopefully accomplish the goal of safer interactions.

Senator Neal:

Whatever is the will of this Committee to simplify it, can be worked out.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.]

Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 362 (R2)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 362 (R2)?

Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director, Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities; and Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I am testifying today both as a constituent and in my professional role. I really hate to be doing that in opposition, but both my husband and I have epilepsy. After a seizure, it is likely we will get aggressive, be unsteady on our feet, may try to run, et cetera. To others, it may appear that we are under the influence. I wear a seatbelt cover that states I have epilepsy and may have a seizure. We both already have on our driver's licenses that we have epilepsy, but I do not believe officers look at this prior to an interaction with the public.

I am torn because the bill states that this designation would be voluntary, but there are certain medical conditions that do not have voluntary reporting needs, such as epilepsy and visual impairments. The reporting is mandatory. Medical providers must report an individual who has a cognitive or medically impairing disability to the DMV. It is just a short step before it is mandatory to report all the conditions that you listed here today, even if it does not impair cognitive ability or the ability to operate a motor vehicle.

I know that the intent behind the bill is to decrease negative interactions with the police and first responders. We understand that, but with a symbol or other indicator of a medical condition on a driver's license, concerns arise about unintentional discrimination that may take place. Equal access to services and supports is the end goal.

Businesses have a right to refuse service to anyone. If you place a patron's protected health information on their driver's license, it is in plain sight. Should a business owner choose to refuse service to that individual, they can and they absolutely will. We understand what you are trying to do, but when you put it on their driver's license, you are forcing an individual to disclose protected health information.

It states voluntary, but I have epilepsy. It is not voluntary. On my driver's license—on the back where you normally see things like restrictions for corrective lenses—it states that I have a medical condition. It is already there. The point of this bill is moot, but you are taking away the right. I appreciate your time today.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 362 (R2)?

Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Department of Motor Vehicles:

There was a question about the fiscal impact of moving the implementation date back. It would take out the programming costs but not the vendor costs.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

It would only take out the \$17,430; everything else would remain, correct?

Sean Sever:

Correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Moving the implementation date would not enhance the bill. It would be better to amend the \$127,772 into the bill. Would that be from the State Highway Fund or the State General Fund?

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

This account has Highway Funds. It would be appropriate to make a Highway Fund appropriation.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 362 (R2)? [There was no one.] Are there any other questions or comments from the Committee?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

The testimony in opposition brought up a question for me. I do not see anywhere in the bill that this is required.

Senator Neal:

It is not required; it is voluntary. They can choose to do it or not do it. There is nothing in the bill that forces them to put HIPAA [Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996] information out there.

She is correct that medical conditions exist in law. As I stated on the record, this is an update from the 2007 law, which had a code. This will make it easier to identify rather than figuring out what a six-digit code means.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

It is one symbol; one could not identify a medical condition based on the symbol, correct?

Senator Neal:

Correct. The Assembly Committee on Judiciary asked me to add a catchall, so it could be any other disease that a citizen chose to ask the DMV to add to the list. The bill does not list hundreds of conditions. It has a catchall provision that allows a citizen to designate health conditions other than what is enumerated in the bill. They have the ability to do so.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

That is how I understood it; thank you for the clarification.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on S.B. 362 (R2). To move this bill along, we need to amend it to add Highway Fund appropriations of \$127,772. I would accept a motion to amend and do pass as amended.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 362 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

We will move on to the hearing for Senate Bill 285.

Senate Bill 285: Makes an appropriation for civics education programs. (BDR S-86)

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8:

Civic education opens the door to democracy by providing support to teachers, empowering students, and engaging the community for a more educated Nevada. The Nevada Center for Civic Engagement provides funding for the We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution Program, which promotes civic competency and responsibility among Nevada students.

This bill makes an appropriation of \$250,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$250,000 in FY 2025 to the Nevada Center for Civic Engagement for the purpose of supporting civic education programs across the state for youth and adult programs. The Legislature has made a similar appropriation in the past three legislative sessions for programming for students. This measure adds additional funding so that the Center can expand this civics program to the adult population.

Shane Piccinini, Co-President, Nevada Center for Civic Engagement:

The We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution Program has been in Nevada for over 35 years. I would like to thank the Committee and members of this body for all the support that we have received, both in terms of your participation in the programs in the classroom as well as the financial support that you have given us in recent legislative sessions.

Christine Hull, Program Director, Nevada Center for Civic Engagement:

I am an educator in the state of Nevada as well as a native of Nevada. Education in this state is my passion. Last month, the results from the 2022 administration of the NAEP [National Assessment of Educational Progress] report in 8th grade civics and history were released. Only one quarter of the students in this nation are proficient in history and civics. That is why our work is more important than ever.

The Nevada Center for Civic Engagement believes that providing opportunities for all children in Nevada to engage in high-quality, inquiry-driven learning supports the growth of their skills and development. It will prepare them for the disposition needed to be community members in the twenty-first century. Our professional learning supports for teachers include implementation of our highly engaging in-depth social studies programs

such as We the People, National History Day, Project Citizen, community engagement and public policy, and Law Day. We deliver engaging content and skills through our Ask the Expert series and our student skills boot camp.

This coming year, we are hoping to bring this high-quality engaging program to even more students across the Silver State, including adults as Senator Dondero Loop mentioned. We have seen an increase in requests for our programming in elementary and middle schools across the state. Senate Bill 285 will provide funding to provide more support to teachers through in-depth professional learning and student engagement opportunities. It will allow students to have a voice and choice in how they engage in their own learning. It will allow communities to engage with students in positive and productive ways, especially our underserved populations, which has been a focus of our work. The passage of S.B. 285 will allow the Nevada Center for Civic Engagement to continue its work and invest in even more classrooms.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

If you have not participated in the We the People, I encourage you to do so; it can be fun and challenging. Are there any questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 285?

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

We would like to express our support for this bill. The Extension already does civic engagement and education through our 4-H youth development program. These funds will open the door to provide even more opportunities for students across the state to take part. We support this bill.

Trevor Parrish, Manager, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

The chamber is in support of S.B. 285 and the allocation that it makes. Therefore we urge your support. Thank you very much.

Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association:

The Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) is in support of S.B. 285. We have supported this every time it has been in front of any committee in this building, and we will keep doing it as long as it is.

Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents:

Like the NSEA, we supported this program throughout, and we will continue to do so because it is a good program.

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

The Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities is happy to support this bill. We host a program called Partners in Policy Making, which provides education on civic

matters and participation in the policy-making process. We highly encourage the use of other programs that also provide that same education. We happily support this bill.

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

I echo Ms. Nielsen's and Ms. Bray's comments. I was involved in a lot of the policymaking in 2014 with Dr. Mary Hylton. We came over there, and she did a great job in mentoring us. We would like to thank the sponsor and the presenter for bringing this forward. We encourage you all to please pass it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 285? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 285? [There was no one.] We will close the hearing on S.B. 285 and open the work session on S.B. 285.

Senate Bill 285: Makes an appropriation for civics education programs. (BDR S-86)

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 285.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

We will move on to the hearing for Senate Bill 339 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 339 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Department of Education for the provision of grants to organizations to provide certain supplies and materials to teachers and specialized instructional support personnel. (BDR S-85)

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Senate District No. 8:

Our teachers and support personnel are hardworking, dedicated individuals who strive for their students' success. However, helping those students achieve success can come at a real cost to our teachers. The National Education Association reported in 2022 that well over 90 percent of teachers spend their own money on school supplies and other items that students need, including paper, notebooks, pencils, classroom books, materials for science projects, and robotics. These contributions cost on average approximately \$500 or more of the teachers' own money. This spending is often coupled with low pay. We would like to use S.B. 339 (R1) to help that along and contribute.

Senate Bill 339 (1st Reprint) seeks to support teachers in providing classroom supplies through:

- Making an appropriation to the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) in the amount of \$10 million.
- Providing authorization to grant the appropriated money to an organization for the purpose of providing necessary classroom materials and supplies identified by teachers for their classrooms.
- Providing the requirements that the NDE enters into that agreement to determine how the granted money will be used.
- Limiting individual awards to \$500 per teacher or specialized instructional personnel per year.

Essentially, teachers will identify their needed materials, they will go through a program to request those materials, and then those materials are awarded and sent back to the teacher. I urge your support of S.B. 339 (R1).

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The \$10 million for the grant is included in the bill, but there was a fiscal note from the NDE for a management analyst position. A lot was removed from the bill in the reprint. Is that still needed?

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

That fiscal note has been removed with the reprint of the bill.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I have questions with the policy, but they will not change my vote.

Will this funding be open to more than one program, or is it only for DonorsChoose, which has been used in the past? DonorsChoose does not always have everything available that some educators would like.

Is this money going to be used in place of putting money toward textbooks? Unfortunately, some individuals have tried to state that funding such as this can be used instead of putting more money into textbooks.

Senator Dondero Loop:

This is not to be used toward textbooks. If a teacher chooses to purchase a classroom set of novels, for example, this may be used for that. I will let Superintendent Ebert address the distribution.

Jhone M. Ebert:

Senator Dondero Loop has sponsored this type of bill for many years in a row. In the past, the money went to the school districts and teachers had to maintain receipts. It was a cumbersome process. The pandemic allowed us to work with the vendor, which took a lot of

work off the educators' shoulders and got the supplies to them rather quickly. We have been recognized nationally. Several other states have picked up on this process. We were the first; they followed after Nevada.

The vendor tries to best fill those specific requests—sometimes teachers get very specific on a type or a brand name of a product. They try to fulfill the specific request, but—to your statement—sometimes they are not able to. We will also look across the nation to see if there are other vendors that do similar work before we move forward.

Assemblywoman Gorelow:

There is some funding on the district level, and we have DonorsChoose. Will this be additional or are they combining? How is that working out?

Senator Dondero Loop:

This money will be specifically for DonorsChoose unless another vendor is chosen. We had great success with them; it has worked out well.

Any money that a school has—for example, from a fundraiser—is discretionary. That remains at the school. A principal may decide to let a teacher use it. That is their money. We do not go into the schools to do this. There may be a school with ten teachers requesting materials, and a school with zero. It is up to the teacher to reach out and request this funding.

In the past, we have had no problem using all these funds, but there are teachers who do not request them. Some teachers who have not requested this funding have said they are not going to request it because they are veteran teachers who can supply materials for their classrooms. They are allowing new teachers to use these funds instead. They have helped their fellow teachers access those funds by using their own money for what they need.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 339 (R1)?

Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association:

I am speaking in support of S.B. 339 (R1). The Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) especially appreciates the inclusion of specialized instruction support personnel.

Trevor Parrish, Manager, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

The Chamber supports S.B. 339 (R1) and the allocation that it makes for our teachers. We urge your support.

Mary Pierczynski, representing Nevada Association of School Superintendents:

The Nevada Association of School Superintendents is in full support of this bill. We want to thank the sponsor for bringing it forward.

Catherine Nielsen, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I am going to testify as a parent. I have two children in the Carson City School District. Oftentimes teachers are not only using their own money, but are asking families to put in some sort of donation or to donate supplies to the classroom. That is often difficult for us as well. This is a commonsense bill that we should be helping to support teachers so that they can continue to educate the next generation of policymakers.

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

I ditto all of Ms. Nielsen's comments and all the support comments. Thank you to the sponsor.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 339 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 339 (R1)? [There was no one.] We will close the hearing on S.B. 339 (R1) and will open the work session on S.B. 339 (R1).

Senate Bill 339 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Department of Education for the provision of grants to organizations to provide certain supplies and materials to teachers and specialized instructional support personnel. (BDR S-85)

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Seeing that the fiscal note was removed, I would accept a motion to do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 339 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

We will open the hearing for Senate Bill 244 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 244 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Other State Education Programs Account for the creation and maintenance of school gardens. (BDR S-557)

Senator Julie Pazina, Senate District No. 12:

Senate Bill 244 (1st Reprint) provides funding to support the creation and maintenance of school garden educational programs in Nevada public schools. In 2017, the Legislature approved Senate Bill 167 of the 79th Session, which for the first time appropriated State General Funds to support the creation and maintenance of school garden programs in

Nevada. Today, S.B. 244 (R1) provides funding for pre-K through 12th grade school garden programs to continue into the next biennium. School garden programs are powerful learning tools for science, technology, engineering, the arts, and math (STEAM) educational programs. I hope some of you had the opportunity to visit the farmers' market in front of the Legislative Building on May 16, 2023, to see some of the students from northern Nevada showing off their skills in financial literacy and entrepreneurship.

In addition to STEAM, financial literacy, and entrepreneurship, research has also found that gardening helps build a sense of community and belonging within both the schools and the broader community, and children engaged in garden programs show improved health outcomes such as eating fresh fruits and vegetables. In addition, these programs are tied to improved mental health and the reduction of anxiety and stress in children.

Senate Bill 244 (1st Reprint) would appropriate \$1.5 million in each year of the 2023-2025 biennium for schools to create and maintain school gardens. The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) would administer this funding to provide grant funding for public schools, including charter schools.

Generally for each school, the funding supports building the program—specifically for things like removing grass, making raised vegetable gardens, planting fruit trees, school curriculum areas, et cetera. To qualify for funding, each school must create and maintain a school garden and develop curriculum relating to the school garden that pertains to Nevada and its desert environment, complying with the academic standards for science and utilizing experiential learning to teach STEM [science, technology, engineering, and math] topics.

This bill also allows for assistance from members of the community who have experience with food education, such as local farmers and chefs. It provides students the ability to operate a farmers' market to sell the produce from the school garden. In April 2023, the largest student-led farmers' market in the nation took place in southern Nevada; it was extremely successful. We are excited to grow the one in northern Nevada. It provides the opportunity for students to see how a meal is cooked using produce grown from the school garden, and establishes garden teams comprised of teachers and, to the extent practicable, parents and members of the community.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Someone from the Department of Education please address the fiscal note.

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

I have to give huge kudos to this program; it has been an extremely successful integration of the curriculum—mathematics, marketing, entrepreneurship, all of those things.

The Department submitted a revised fiscal note this morning—a much lower cost. We were able to remove the Education Programs Professional position because this Committee and others approved the K-5 STEM earlier. We just left the 0.5 FTE [full-time equivalent] Management Analyst position. Deputy Peterson can describe the work there.

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

The management analyst position will assist with preaward risk assessment as well as the monitoring associated with all our subgrant recipients. Our work has continued to grow in that area, so we want to have support to ensure those dollars are used efficiently and effectively.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

What is the total of the fiscal note now?

Jhone M. Ebert:

For fiscal year (FY) 2024, it is \$54,538. For FY 2025, it is \$60,348. Future biennia are projected at a total of \$100,216.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I have a question about section 1, subsection 2(g), which adds oversight by the Office of Science, Innovation and Technology (OSIT), Office of the Governor. Why was this OSIT certification added into the criteria for the bill, and what does it mean to be identified as high quality by OSIT?

Senator Pazina:

To take part in this program, we look for approval by the Nevada Department of Education, and we look for an approved aligned curriculum. The STEM certification requirement is trying to ensure that we have the highest quality curriculum that is focused on science, technology, engineering, and math.

Assemblywoman Peters:

How many entities that have provided the services previously, or have been granted these dollars, have that certification already?

Senator Pazina:

Green Our Planet—which is working with a number of pre-K through 12 programs throughout the state right now—has that certification. I hope that a number of others are working toward it. The NDE might have a better idea than I have.

Jhone M. Ebert:

I do not have that number, but that STEM certification from OSIT is helpful to the program. We align work with OSIT.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I have had a different experience with OSIT. I do not love this part of the bill. In northern Nevada, my children's school set up a nonprofit to do their garden work, and trying to go through this process is an additional burden on them. It is also my understanding that this certification process can take two years, which means if someone is starting to apply for this program right now, they will not even be able to apply for these funds in the biennium.

I would encourage changing that requirement to an optional alternative to the school districts' curriculum approval. Washoe County School District (WCSD) already has a process for approving these types of curriculums, and criteria has been set. Maybe next year we can figure out how to fit this certification in, but for the moment I am uncomfortable with including that piece. The timeline could eliminate programs that do not already have the OSIT certification from receiving any of this funding this biennium.

Senator Pazina:

We are trying to make this garden experience as educational as possible. Adding that requirement helps to ensure that curriculum objective is met.

Ciara Byrne, Founder and CEO, Green Our Planet:

I am happy to address Assemblywoman Peters' concern. Essentially, it is true. It took us almost two years to complete the STEMworks accreditation. This is specifically for schools, and the STEMworks accreditation is focused on next-generation science standards and ensuring that any organizations working with students in STEM are providing the highest standards of curriculum that meet all the next-generation science standards. That is why Senator Pazina and other people are involved in putting together this bill; they want to ensure that all our students and schools will have the best quality STEM education.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I believe that subsection creates a discrepancy of who can participate in the program. We have already stood up so many of these in my district. There are schools that do not have the resources to go through the certification process.

The bill is underbaked if the processes and outreach are limiting the access to these funds—especially with almost five times the amount that has been previously requested. That puts a burden on the communities that have established these programs.

Senator Pazina:

Thank you for your concern. This was added into the bill because we wanted to provide the most possible oversight and accountability to ensure the best and most aligned curriculum possible for our kids in Nevada schools. I have not gone through the STEMworks certification for any program, so I cannot speak to that experience. The only reason it was included in the bill was for accountability and oversight to ensure the most aligned curriculum possible. If that is something that this Committee cannot get over, and you feel the NDE would be best served by taking that out, that is a conversation I am happy to have. The only reason for this was to provide accountability and oversight in the best possible programming for kids in Nevada schools, because we certainly do not want to ask for—as you mentioned—a large appropriation without oversight and accountability in place.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I appreciate the desire to do that. At my children's school, the PTA [Parent-Teacher Association], the school, and WCSD have oversight of the curriculum. The NDE also has oversight of the curriculum with these funds. There are several layers of oversight already.

I do not disagree that the OSIT certification is important to ensure that we are meeting a standard for STEM. However, at this moment it creates a bigger burden and hurdle than is appropriate in the biennium. I recommend that we remove that component.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

On page 2, line 2, the bill mentions nonprofit organizations, but later—in subsection 3(g), which Assemblywoman Peters brought up—it seems more specific.

Have there been discussions with those groups that are active in WCSD? If so, has there been discussion about working together to review their curriculum?

Marco Rauda, representing Green Our Planet:

We have had discussions with several groups, not just in northern Nevada; we fund a lot of other separate organizations. We would be willing to regrant; the process of regranting is simple. All they have to do is take the Green Our Planet curriculum that is already in Canvas, already funded through the Department of Education. That could be a process as well.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

What is Canvas?

Jhone M. Ebert:

Canvas is a tool that allows curriculum to be made available across the entire state. The Legislature has graciously funded that as well; it is available for all our students and teachers.

Marco Rauda:

I have heard that there are other groups already in the certification process as well. We welcome all the groups. Please go ahead and get the certification. As the sponsor mentioned, we just want to ensure accountability with this funding.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 244 (R1)?

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

We would like to express our strong support for this. The Extension hosted by the University of Nevada, Reno—particularly in Clark County—has a school garden program. We worked directly with schools to help them—not do it for them, but to help them—set up school gardens. We work with teachers to make sure they have defined criteria and curriculum aligned with academic content standards.

We would be more than happy to work closer with NDE on this and help share what we have existing. There is also a professional development part for those teachers. It is not just setting up the gardens. It is how to maintain it themselves, how they can grow and develop

that, and be aware of the environment they are in. We fully support this bill. We thank Senator Pazina for bringing it forward. We see so many of those benefits that she talked about in her presentation are true for the students we see in classes.

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

The Nevada Conservation League is here in support of S.B. 244 (R1). School gardens help kids get outside and learn about nature, and they support our local food chain. We urge the Committee's support.

Alexander Marks, Communications Specialist, Nevada State Education Association:

The Nevada State Education Association is in support of S.B. 244 (R1). School gardens have been shown to improve academic achievement, increase student connection to the natural environment, and increase student interest and achievement in science. We stand in full support.

Andrew M. Belanger, Director, Public Services, Las Vegas Valley Water District:

The Las Vegas Valley Water District is in support of S.B. 244 (R1). The Springs Preserve also has quite a number of videos online and resources at our teaching garden to provide support for schools that wish to have community gardens. We strongly support S.B. 244 (R1). We appreciate that it provides funding for both creation and maintenance. Maintenance concerns are important. We have videos to help make sure people understand how to maintain those gardens because that is an important part.

Tony Ramirez, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada:

On behalf of our Make the Road Nevada youth members, our environmental committee members, and our health committee members, I am here in support.

Janet Quintero, Vice President, External Affairs, United Way of Southern Nevada:

I am here to testify in support of S.B. 244 (R1). As a supporter of school gardens in our southern Nevada area, we know that it is an important program for our students. I am happy to testify in support.

Annette Dawson Owens, School Readiness Policy Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance of Nevada:

We are enthusiastically supporting S.B. 244 (R1). As an educator who has put in and maintained multiple school gardens, I love so many components of this bill, including serving lots of Title I schools, the possibility to teach gardening to students with disabilities, and providing high-quality STEM education. I love the monthly garden team meetings that are a possibility, as well as the career paths and chef visits—especially with our hospitality expertise and ties here in Nevada.

I appreciate the hydroponic option and the farmers' market component. We recently had an amazing one here in Summerlin, and the financial literacy that comes from such an experience is hugely impactful for students. Maybe the most important thing is the ability to have access and experiences with fresh, healthy vegetables and foods in our schools, the

communities, and the mental health and wellness benefits that come from this. We know firsthand all the possibilities that come with the creation and funding of gardens and the learning engagement that will ensue for Nevada students.

One concern we want to emphasize with these funds is the accountability that the garden must be maintained and kept up, which does require intentional efforts and funding.

Camila Rios, representing Three Square Food Bank:

We would like to thank you for considering S.B. 244 (R1) today. Many thanks to Green Our Planet and the bill's many sponsors for championing this critical legislation. Childhood is a critical time in the life of an individual when lifelong eating habits are established and the access—or lack thereof—to food influences future potential health and wellness of individuals.

Based on 2021 Feeding America Map the Meal Gap data, more than 93,000 Nevada children resided in a household with food insecurity. Food insecurity is interwoven through our southern Nevada community and deeply impacts children and their families. Childhood and adolescence are critical times for growth and development. If preventive measures are taken during this period, future health conditions can be reduced or mitigated.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention cites a handful of dietary items that, if introduced into an individual meal pattern at two years old and onward, can aid in health and wellness. Those items include fruits and vegetables, whole grains, fat-free and low-fat dairy products, and protein-rich foods.

The introduction of school gardens into school systems and communities improves overall food systems that have been notoriously characterized by diets that are low in fruits and vegetables and high in sugar and other simple carbs. Additionally, these food systems are often characterized by immense shortages of healthy, affordable, accessible, and reliable food options.

School garden programming not only has immense educational benefits for Nevada's children, it also alters how residents in underserved neighborhoods think about their food choices, improves fruit and vegetable consumption, integrates more local food in resident diets, and provides access to food not previously tried or available to residents.

Senate Bill 244 (R1) seeks to greatly benefit our state's children and their families. Three Square thanks you all for your consideration and requests your support.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in opposition to S.B. 244 (R1)?

Lisa Ortega, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

In my regular workday, I have provided fruit trees to many schools and have worked with many fabulous nonprofits. I am for the funding of school gardens, gardens for schools, and

their maintenance. I am concerned about the OSIT policy—a national policy—which completely limits the ability of nonprofits and their beautiful work in Nevada to be able to partake in this bill.

Tribes wanting to implement school gardens could not apply for this funding to grow culturally significant crops with their elders and their Nevada qualified teachers. Successful school garden farms in Reno, especially for school learning—which have schools coming to them, serve thousands of students without a garden at their schools, and are highly successful with over three gardens up and running—will not be able to apply.

I am asking you to change the language that burdens our fully educated science teachers who meet all Nevada and school district qualifications for teaching. I am for the funding of school gardens, gardens for schools, and their maintenance. However, with the OSIT requirement, this bill is one-size-fits-one, not one-size-fits-all for Nevada. I am asking you, on behalf of many beautiful community garden programs, to please change the policy in this bill.

Dora Martinez, representing Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:

This is Dora Martinez with Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition. I would echo Ms. Ortega and the concern from Assemblywoman Peters. Please make this curriculum more inclusive with diversity, equity, and accessibility for all nonprofits.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 244 (R1)?

Linda Flaherty, Community Educator, Healthy Communities Coalition of Lyon and Storey Counties:

I worked in a school district for 30 years; my last month was July 2022. I was a science teacher for 15 years; I am familiar with the Nevada academic science standards. I also taught in special education and was an administrator for 15 years—as a dean, assistant principal, and principal. I have seen over the years what has occurred, especially in the last four years with the pandemic and after the pandemic, with students way behind—especially in math—with their skill levels. It is difficult to watch because these students come back trying; they still cannot get it, and then they have some behavior issues.

Gardens are critical with social and emotional learning, and critical for STEAM. It is important that these students get access to project-based learning because that is how they get engaged; that is how they remember; that is how they get excited all the way through K-12 systems and into, believe it or not—when you are looking at 13 and 14—the community colleges. I think it is super-duper important that we pass that. We are neutral. I am neutral for this position, but I do not want to see, because of some legality regarding a curriculum, that it does not pass.

I know that there is a problem, that different agencies are worried about the curriculum, but I think it is important to really take a look. We are trying to help kids all the way up after the

pandemic and actually learn and get better at their different reading, writing, and math skills. If we do not take a look at that, maybe we can be a little bit more lenient on what type of curriculum is going to be approved so that all agencies, after-school programs, Title I, and K-12 education systems still have that opportunity to work with the garden. It is so important.

Senator Pazina:

Senate Bill 244 (1st Reprint) is obviously an important bill to the community. To follow up on Assemblywoman Anderson's question: A number of groups came to us during the process. We found that a number of those groups were looking to fund community gardens, not school gardens. That was a challenge we had throughout this process. They wanted this bill not to go through NDE and to fund different community gardens. While those are important, this bill is specifically for school gardens.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 244 (R1) and move on to the work session for Senate Bill 452, which was heard by the Committee on May 23, 2023.

Senate Bill 452: Revises provisions governing the allocation of the proceeds of the basic governmental services tax. (BDR 43-1204)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Senate Bill 452 would allocate all proceeds from the basic tax for governmental services imposed on vehicles into the State Highway Fund. Under current law, 25 percent of the proceeds from these taxes is allocated to the State General Fund and the remaining 75 percent is allocated to the Highway Fund. Should this pass, \$27.6 million in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$28.3 million in FY 2025 would be deposited into the Highway Fund rather than the General Fund based on the Economic Forum's May forecast.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 452.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

We must get to the floor, and then there will be a few meetings before this Committee reconvenes. We are going to go into recess until the call of the Chair.

[The Committee recessed at 12:46 p.m. and reconvened at 11:04 p.m.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will reconvene with hearings and work sessions on the two bills we were not able to do this morning, starting with Assembly Bill 237 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 237 (1st Reprint): Makes revisions relating to health care. (BDR 38-328)

Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24:

Assembly Bill 237 (1st Reprint) is the product of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services. However, it is better at being the vehicle for the second amendment to the bill, which you have before you today [[Exhibit D](#)]. This proposed amendment would make it a fix-it bill allocating certain funds for nursing facilities to ensure that people get paid adequately.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

I am trying to understand the big picture on health care clinics at schools in this bill.

Assemblywoman Peters:

The amendment deletes the bill in its entirety and replaces it with a funding appropriation. The amendment is all that would be left now [[Exhibit D](#)].

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

To clarify, the proposed amendment essentially replaces the original bill with an appropriation bill. This new bill would include State General Fund appropriations of approximately \$2.6 million in fiscal year (FY) 2024 and \$6.5 million in FY 2025, as well as authorizations of \$8.2 million in FY 2024 and \$19.5 million in FY 2025, to support a Medicaid rate increase for skilled nursing facilities. The rate would be increased to \$275 per day beginning January 1, 2024.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

What type of facility would receive this increased rate?

Sarah Coffman:

This would apply to skilled nursing facilities.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions or comments from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 237 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 237 (R1)?

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:

I waited here all day to testify on the other bill. We appreciate the amendment; I do not have time to thoroughly explore it, but we are glad that the other portion of the bill has been removed, so I will not be testifying against it.

Barbara Jones, Private Citizen, Washoe County, Nevada:

I do not have a copy of the amendment, so I will just go with the original bill that I have here.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

That bill is no longer in existence; it is gone. The amendment is the only part of the bill that remains.

Barbara Jones:

I will just say I am against school health clinics and all that stuff.

Jim DeGraffenreid, National Committeeman, Nevada Republican Party:

We also have been waiting all day and night to be in opposition to the original bill. Since we have not seen the new bill—and apparently nobody else has either—we would recommend a no vote on a bill that has not had an opportunity to be viewed or vetted.

Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada:

I am glad to hear that there was an amendment; I guess it will make things better. I just wanted to let you know I am still here in spirit, if not sitting there with you tonight.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 237 (R1)?

Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County:

I want to go on the record on the amendment. Clark County is neutral because the counties in the state pay a portion of the Medicaid rate that goes to long-term care. I have been working with Ms. Weeks to determine the impact of this rate increase. We think the county portion over the biennium—with the increase already included in the budget plus this new rate increase—would be approximately \$6.6 million for counties statewide.

Clark County pays on average about 70 percent of that. We are going to work through this to see how we can work with the state to make it happen. We are neutral because we know this is a big need in our community. We have a lot of need for skilled nursing facility care in Clark County. We are hoping this bill will help get more of our constituents served, if possible.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

The Department of Health and Human Services had fiscal notes on the original bill. However, as it is amended, I do not know if you have had an opportunity to think about if there would be any fiscal impact.

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

The numbers quoted in the amendment are what we would need to do this rate increase.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

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

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 237 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Hafen:

This is a good policy now; I appreciate the amendment. I want to speak with the counties, so I am going to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor. I will vote this out of Committee, but I want to figure out what the fiscal impact is.

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

[Assemblywoman Backus assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Backus:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 525.

Assembly Bill 525: Makes appropriations for various purposes relating to health, education and employment. (BDR S-1225)

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

Assembly Bill 525 is a measure from this Committee that appropriates funds for various purposes relating to health, education, and employment. At the end of every session, we have a bill commonly referred to as the Christmas tree bill. We know that there are many needs in our communities that we cannot always fit into our regular budget.

Every time this bill comes out, it has at least three nonprofits listed in it. It has been customary that the Chair of the Senate Committee on Finance and the Chair of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means get together to decide what can go into the Christmas tree bill. I am presenting what is going into the bill from the Assembly side, and there will be things added to it from the Senate side. There may be some of your favorite nonprofit organizations that you do not see in the bill as it is presented tonight, but may be in the bill as it gets to the Governor's desk for a signature.

This bill includes an appropriation to the Expanding the Leaderverse program at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) International Gaming Institute. For all the sessions I have been in this building, this has been in the bill to bring diversity and leadership to our gaming industry. United Way of Southern Nevada and United Way of Northern

Nevada and the Sierra are also in the bill as well as the Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow. Those were first included to draft the bill.

While I have been in this Legislature, we have not had a lot of money to put into a Christmas tree bill. The larger nonprofits always got the funding, and smaller nonprofits throughout the state were not included. The amendment is lengthy [\[Exhibit E\]](#). I wish we could have included everyone who made an ask, but we could not.

The final bill, as it works its way through the Senate and the Chair of the Senate Committee on Finance adds a few more things to it, will do a lot of good in this legislative session. We may never be able to put this kind of money into a Christmas tree bill ever again, so I took full advantage to try to get many different areas.

You will see some capital improvements with large amounts. Some nonprofits have an opportunity to purchase buildings. They were in the middle of a deal, but interest rates went up extremely high and left them out of the market. We are helping them out tonight.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

Working with our nonprofits is so important. Frankly, they do a better job than government. If we can give the money to them and they are focused on how they want to help people, it is great. I am curious what the total appropriations are for this bill this year and how they compare to previous sessions.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

Fiscal staff may be able to speak to amounts from previous sessions. The amendment before you tonight [\[Exhibit E\]](#) adds \$54.7 million to the \$3.95 million from the original legislation.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

You must have received double the requests from nonprofits that I did. The work you did with this amendment reflects the nonprofits on the ground working with the constituents that we represent—the nonprofits that make a difference in the lives of Nevadans. Every day, Nevadans use the work of nonprofits. Thank you for the hours and days that you put into selecting these nonprofits.

Vice Chair Backus:

I will echo that. Does anyone else have any questions or comments?

Assemblyman Hafen:

Thank you, Chair Monroe-Moreno, for all this work. The \$54.7 million proposed here is in addition to what is already in the language. There is \$3.95 million in the bill, and \$54.7 million being added, for a total of approximately \$58 million. Could Fiscal staff give amounts from another good year, such as 2019, to compare, please?

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:

Senate Bill 501 of the 80th Session appropriated \$6.2 million in the nonprofit bill in 2019.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

As the chair of the Nonprofit Legislative Caucus, I thank you, Chair Monroe-Moreno. I know how much work this is, and how big the asks are that come to us. The organizations reflected here are essential to ensuring stability in our communities. I want to thank you, and congratulate you, for your work in this great success.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Ditto. I give you my greatest appreciation. This will make a huge impact. I am glad we were able to do it this year. It is late, so I am afraid to ask this one question: would misspelled organization names be an issue?

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

No, the Legal Division will put this all into appropriate language and fix it.

Vice Chair Backus:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 525?

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

Thank you for tackling this bill; I understand the difficulty. The United Labor Agency of Nevada is included in this bill. We were considered essential during COVID-19 and did a lot of work during COVID-19. Our mission is to keep families stable. The way to solve homelessness is to keep people in their homes. This money to all these different nonprofits will go very far in helping Nevada families become stable and successful in the future.

Dan Musgrove, representing Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow:

Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow was a part of the initial bill. Upwards of 300 people will have their lives changed because they will have a chance to get a career that will put them on a path to probably never having to go on public assistance again. We are excited about this. We have a couple of other clients on here: Goodwill of Southern Nevada and Chicanos Por La Causa. Kudos to the Chair and all the work that this Committee does.

Zoë Houghton, representing United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra:

United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra is in Section 2 of the bill, as introduced. We sincerely appreciate being included. This appropriation will help us expand the United Readers Program, which provides essential early childhood literacy skills. We thank the sponsor for bringing this bill.

Tom Clark, Board Member, Pioneer Center for the Performing Arts:

The Pioneer Center for the Performing Arts is a nonprofit that I was recently named to; it is not a paid client of mine. This is a big deal. In its 55 years, the Pioneer Center for the Performing Arts has never asked the state Legislature for anything. They thought, Why in the world would they want to support us? This demonstrates to the northern Nevada community that the arts and culture are important—that this center is important. This will be seed money to renovate a facility that desperately needs it.

We have one of the best lineups for Broadway this year that I have ever seen. Come to northern Nevada and see some of the performances that we have. This is not just for the performing arts center, though. When I say seed money, we are beginning the process of a master plan that will bridge the gap between what has been done in midtown Reno and what the University of Nevada, Reno wants to do to the north. It is going to be something that will mature and grow over the next couple of years. This seed money sends a clear message to northern Nevada that you care as much as we do. We appreciate your support.

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

The Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada is in this bill; thank you for that. Also, some of the other nonprofits included here are our clients. It would be hard for me to find ones that do not benefit our clients. Everybody on these lists—we refer our clients to these nonprofits. Thank you for your work.

Janet Quintero, Vice President, External Affairs, United Way of Southern Nevada:

In the interest of time, I will just say thank you to the Chair, the Committee, and the Nonprofit Caucus, and reiterate the commitment of United Way of Southern Nevada to our community. We are in support.

Becky Harris, representing University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

I am speaking on behalf of the Leaderverse initiatives at UNLV. Jan Jones Blackhurst regrets that she could not make it. She is on the East Coast, and it is the middle of the night there. We want to thank you for considering us.

This appropriation will allow the Leaderverse initiatives to provide skills training, reskilling, and upskilling to women and marginalized populations throughout the entire state of Nevada, not just southern Nevada. It also allows us to continue to administer the Nevada Workforce Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Study; each of you should have received our inaugural copy. This is the first of its kind survey study in the state of Nevada; it provides insights into employment trends within the state and helps to inform public policy around how women and marginalized populations experience the workplace.

Finally, this appropriation puts us on the path to sustainability. We are grateful for the investment the Legislature has made in our programming efforts. This is the last time we will be requesting legislative support for the Leaderverse. Thank you for helping us get to sustainability; we are going to thank you by not being back next legislative session.

Vice Chair Backus:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 525? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 525? [There was no one.] I would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 525.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Miller:

I am excited about this, but I must disclose that I am employed by the sister organization to the Urban Chamber Community Development Corporation. Out of an abundance of caution, I will abstain from making any votes on A.B. 525.

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

Vice Chair Backus:

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

[Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

This meeting is adjourned [at 11:36 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Anna Freeman
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a sample notice of increase in Supplemental Security Income payments, submitted by the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 237, submitted and presented by Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24.

[Exhibit E](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 525, submitted and presented by Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1.