

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR**

**Eighty-Third Session
May 30, 2025**

The Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Elaine H. Marzola at 12:34 p.m. on Friday, May 30, 2025, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 1 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, 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/83rd2025.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Elaine H. Marzola, Chair
Assemblymember Sandra Jauregui, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Natha C. Anderson
Assemblymember Max E. Carter II
Assemblymember Lisa K. Cole
Assemblymember Melissa R. Hardy
Assemblymember Heidi Kasama
Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller
Assemblymember Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblymember PK O'Neill
Assemblymember Erica P. Roth
Assemblymember Selena Torres-Fossett
Assemblymember Steve Yeager
Assemblymember Toby Yurek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen, Senate District No. 3
Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9
Senator Nicole Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6
Senator Dina Neal, Senate District No. 4



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst
Sam Quast, Committee Counsel
Daniel Peinado, Committee Counsel
Logan B. Service, Committee Manager
Denise Dimarzo, Committee Secretary
Julie Axelson, Committee Secretary
George Whalen, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General
Bethany Farris, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Mark J. Krueger, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Consumer Counsel, Bureau of
Consumer Protection, Office of the Attorney General
Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General
Carissa Pearce, Government Affairs Manager, Children's Advocacy Alliance
Deborah Earl, Chief Operating Officer and Vice President, Power2Parents,
Las Vegas, Nevada
Aodhan Downey, State Policy Manager West, Computer & Communications Industry
Association
Jose Torres Casillas, Deputy Executive Director, California and Southwest Region,
TechNet
Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada
Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Amy Bos, Director, State and Federal Affairs, NetChoice
Nicole Lopez, Director and Associate General Counsel, Global Litigation Strategy,
Meta Platforms, Inc.
Yolanda Knaak, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada
Tara C. Raines, Deputy Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance
Patricia Charlton, Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education
Leonardo Benavides, Director, State Government Affairs and Community
Engagement, Office of Government and Community Engagement, University
of Nevada, Las Vegas
Sheila Bray, Director of Government and Community Engagement, University of
Nevada, Reno
Dan Musgrove, Senior Vice President, Clark County Children's Mental Health
Consortium; and representing Prime Therapeutics
Annette Magnus-Marquart, representing MomsRising Together
Bradley Mayer, representing Raise the Future
Linda Buckardt, Nevadans CAN, Henderson, Nevada
Keiko Duncan, PharmD, Medicaid Pharmacy Director, Division of Health Care
Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services

Keibi Mejia, representing Nevada Society for Dermatology and Dermatologic Surgery
Liz MacMenamin, Vice President of Government Affairs, Retail Association of Nevada
Amanda Klein, Founder and President, Nevada Fertility Advocates
Jacqueline L. Nguyen, Policy Director, Nevada State Medical Association
Sarah Adler, representing American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Nevada Section
Annie Vong, representing Leukemia Lymphoma Society; and Nevada Public Health Association
Yoana Ontiveros, representing Henderson Chamber of Commerce
Mo Denis, representing Americans for Contraception
Jennifer Lopez, Private Citizen, Clark County, Nevada
Maddison Proctor, representing Nevada Women's Lobby
Leah Kaye, MD, Fertility Center of Las Vegas
Elizabeth Lopez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jennifer Atlas, Government Relations Director, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network
Samantha Barnes, representing Comprehensive Cancer Centers of Nevada
Jenny Stepp, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Bri Schmidt, Program Associate, Silver State Equality
Kendahl Servino, Board Member, Nevada Fertility Advocates
Jennifer Peterson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Cyndy Flores, Private Citizen
Melissa Clement, Executive Director, Nevada Right to Life
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom
Cliff Nellis, Evangelist/Shepherd, Freedom Evangelism
Joshua Skaggs, Legislative Affairs Director, Nevada Republican Party
Teresa DeGraffenreid, Private Citizen, Douglas County, Nevada
Katrín Ivanoff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Cristiane Mersch, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Cynthia Perine, Private Citizen
Adam Plain, Insurance Regulation Liaison, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry
Shelly Capurro, representing Nevada Association of Health Plans
Krystal Minera-Alvis, Private Citizen
Jason Mills, representing Nevada Justice Association
Todd Ingalsbee, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada
John Abel, Director, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association
Paul J. Enos, Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Trucking Association
Andrew MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Harrison Porter, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Metro Police Managers and Supervisors Association
Misty Grimmer, representing Nevada Resort Association; and Employers Insurance Company of Nevada

Jason Gray, Vice President of Government Affairs, MGM Resorts
Olivia Tanager, Director, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club
Jackie Spicer, Coalition Coordinator, Nevada Environmental Justice Coalition
Jordan Chong, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Tracy Bower, Director of External Affairs and Communications, Desert Research Institute
Jay Parmer, representing Nevada Manufacturers Association
John Keane, Manager of Government Relations, Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers

Chair Marzola:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] Today we will hear six bills: Senate Bill 63 (1st Reprint), Senate Bill 165 (2nd Reprint), Senate Bill 173 (2nd Reprint), Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint), Senate Bill 317 (2nd Reprint), and Senate Bill 389 (2nd Reprint). I do plan to take those in order. We will also conduct a work session. With that, we will begin our work session. We will start with Senate Bill 170 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 170 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to industrial insurance. (BDR 53-632)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 170 (2nd Reprint) revises provisions relating to industrial insurance. It was sponsored by Senator Steinback and heard May 28, 2025 [[Exhibit C](#)]. There are no proposed amendments.

Chair Marzola:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 170 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 170 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CARTER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBERS MONROE-MORENO
AND YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Carter. Next is Senate Bill 231 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 231 (1st Reprint): Establishes provisions relating to the collection and destruction of unused drugs. (BDR 54-564)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 231 (1st Reprint) establishes provisions relating to the collection and destruction of unused drugs. It was sponsored by Senator Stone and heard May 28, 2025 [[Exhibit D](#)]. There are no proposed amendments.

Chair Marzola:

Members, any questions on S.B. 231 (R1)? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 231 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MILLER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 231 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBERS MONROE-MORENO
AND YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Yurek. Next is Senate Bill 344 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 344 (1st Reprint): Requires certain health insurance to cover certain screenings for certain genetic disorders. (BDR 57-1104)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 344 (1st Reprint) requires certain health insurance to cover certain screenings for certain genetic disorders. It was sponsored by Senator Cannizzaro and heard May 28, 2025 [[Exhibit E](#)]. There are no proposed amendments.

Chair Marzola:

Members, any questions on S.B. 344 (R1)? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 344 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 344 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBERS MONROE-MORENO
AND YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Hardy. Next is Senate Bill 376 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 376 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing industrial insurance. (BDR 53-629)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 376 (1st Reprint) revises provisions governing industrial insurance. It was sponsored by Senator Daly and heard on May 28, 2025 [[Exhibit F](#)]. There are no proposed amendments.

Chair Marzola:

Members, any questions on S.B. 376 (R1)? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 376 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 376 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBERS MONROE-MORENO
AND YEAGER WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Anderson. That concludes our work session for now. I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 63 (1st Reprint). This measure revises provisions relating to the use of certain online products and services by minors and children. Attorney General Ford, welcome to Commerce and Labor, and all your presenters. You may begin when you are ready.

Senate Bill 63 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the use of certain online products and services by minors and children. (BDR 52-505)

Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General:

I am your Attorney General here today to present to you Senate Bill 63 (1st Reprint), which my office affectionately refers to as Victoria's Law for reasons that will become apparent later in our presentation. Senate Bill 63 (1st Reprint) presents us an opportunity to discuss something that frankly should unite all of us, and that is keeping our kids safe, this time in the context of digital platforms.

In that regard, this bill has a tripartite purpose, namely predation, privacy, and the protection of youths' mental health. With regard to the first, predation, we all know digital platforms and social media are not just a tool anymore. They are seemingly the air our kids breathe. They do not remember a world without it. While it has changed the way we connect, it has given predators a direct line to our children. Let us be clear: predators are not always now only lurking in dark alleys. They do not have to hang around playgrounds or malls anymore. They can slide into a child's DMs [direct message] and pose as a peer-aged friend and start the process of grooming these kids, slowly breaking down the kid's defenses until they can exploit them.

In written testimony presented to this Committee, you will read from my investigations team how predators use some digital platforms to shower kids with attention, with compliments, and even with gifts such as virtual game tokens. They make the child feel special and understood, like they finally know someone who gets them. Over time, they manipulate the child, and they are taking risks, sharing personal details, some photos, or engaging in conversations they normally would not have. Once that happens, things escalate quickly.

We have seen the cases in my office of children being blackmailed, harassed, and in some cases, lured into real-world danger. This is not a hypothetical; it is happening right now. Investigators in my office and across the state are working on these cases every single day, including right now as I speak. The predators who are chasing are smart, patient, and relentless. Unfortunately, digital platforms sometimes, albeit unwillingly, make their jobs way too easy.

Additional written testimony submitted to this Committee supports this motion. A number of students from Equipo Academy in East Las Vegas [[Exhibit G](#)] testified in the Senate and they implore this body to do something about the violence and the other unhealthy behaviors that are so easily amplified on digital platforms.

In just a few minutes, you will hear from the young lady to my left, Bethany Farris, a mother from Reno who will testify as to her own experience as a mother who has suffered greatly because of the harms her daughter experienced on various digital platforms.

In addition, students, parents, and law enforcement professionals who encounter these dangers on a daily basis also support the need for protections proposed in this bill, which in its current iteration takes simple, common-sense steps to put real guardrails in place and it locks down children's data. Companies cannot collect information on the child's social media usage and then turn around and use it to track or otherwise advertise to them. In my estimation, keeping kids safe should not be optional, and we are making sure it is not. Keeping kids safe online is not just about blocking predators. It is also about the well-being and mental health of our children and adolescents, which brings me to the second purpose of the bill.

On this point I readily admit, let me repeat, I readily admit data suggests adolescents can benefit and have beneficial experiences with age-appropriate use of social media. But there is also a large body of data that shows a full-blown mental health crisis among children. We cannot afford to ignore it.

What we know is this: According to the Pew Research Center, 95 percent of youth ages 13 to 17 say they use social media. More than a third report they are on social media almost constantly. That makes sense because platforms are actually designed to be addictive, keeping kids locked in an endless cycle of comparison, validation, and exposure to content that can be toxic.

In this regard, exposure to cyberbullying and cyberhate leaves kids feeling isolated, anxious, and depressed more than ever. Some of this encourages self-harm and maladaptive behavior because it warps their self-esteem, especially for teenage girls. We all know digital platforms are built by design to keep people, especially young people, engaged as long as possible. Algorithms push extreme information because it keeps users hooked. They collect more data the more time these users spend on their platforms, and the more data they collect, the more money they can make.

Our bill seeks to curb corporate malfeasance by imposing certain guardrails for covered digital platforms to implement related to minors' accounts with certain exceptions, as well as empowering parents and legal guardians to set exactly what they want and do not want their children to use, see, utilize, and interact with on digital accounts. It is a parent empowerment bill.

Finally, let us address one more thing: privacy. This iteration of S.B. 63 (R1) also implements robust privacy protections for children under the age of 13 who are using these online platforms. These protections are largely based off of House Bill (HB) 707 from the Virginia Legislature, which was signed into law in 2024. Senate Bill 63 (1st Reprint) would now require certain online platforms to obtain the consent of a parent or guardian of a child under the age of 13 before using that child's personal data in any way. Further, those online platforms would be completely prohibited from using such child's personal data for providing targeted advertising to the child, selling the personal data of the child, or profiling the child in any way; that is from the Virginia bill. Further, unless a narrow exception applies, these online platforms would be prohibited from collecting the precise geolocation data from a user they know to be a child under the age of 13.

Senate Bill 63 (1st Reprint) also requires online platforms to conduct data protection assessments when they collect data of users who are under the age of 13. These assessments must list the benefits and risks of collecting, retaining, and using the data and must also work to reduce the risks they identify. The online platforms would need to make these assessments available to my office upon request. Online platforms will be given 30 days to remedy any violations these data protection provisions require, and a failure to remedy that violation will constitute a deceptive trade practice under our statutes.

I will say, before I turn the mic to Ms. Farris, Chair Marzola, this has been a labor that has taken the entirety of this session to get to this point. When we presented this bill in the Senate, we had, and you may have today, a lot of opposition testimony.

We had a working group we convened and inquired from them on how best to articulate a bill to accommodate the three goals I have mentioned: predation, privacy, and protection of mental health. We received some amendments, and we were able to accommodate a lot of those things. A big concession I made at the very beginning: I wanted age verification. I wanted all of these social media and digital platform companies to verify ages. I took it out; that was a humongous concession. Many said they are already doing it because they have teen accounts. They know how to verify because they have teen accounts, but they complained they could not get it done, and I conceded to that. Instead, what we did was put in a litany of parental controls I have just described in this bill.

We would hope to continue this bill moving forward, and we will be able to get this put out because this is an opportunity for us to protect our youth, to empower parents to be more engaged if they want to be engaged, and to be able to protect their children as they utilize these platforms.

With that, I would like to introduce Bethany Farris to the Committee. Then I will turn it over to Mark Krueger to briefly summarize the substance of the bill, and then we will be out of your hair.

[[Exhibit H](#) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Bethany Farris, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

This is Victoria; this is my daughter [showed picture]. She was 11 when she died. Victoria was born on June 12, 2013, at 12:22 p.m. She was so full of energy and passion, and way too smart for her own good. I had the pleasure of being her mother for 11 years, as she died on Friday, August 23, 2024. I found her hanging from her bed. She is the youngest preteen to have committed suicide in Washoe County.

Did you know the number one killer of teens and preteens in Washoe County is suicide? It is amazing how you do not become aware until it actually happens to you. If this bill passes, it will save so many other parents from having to go through what I went through. From the grief and the hard questions, such as, do you want your daughter cremated or buried? Something I thought I would never have to answer.

Victoria was able to look up on TikTok how to tie the knot that ended her life. She also had a TikTok video playing while she hung there dying that played over and over again. It was of two sisters dancing around, and it was stating, You are not going to know this. But in five years, I am going to try over and over again. So, my daughter was able to watch all these sad reels that eventually pushed her to kill herself.

Let me see. She had so many hidden TikTok accounts I was not aware of. All I ever saw her do were her little dances; her little dances she just practiced over and over. I was not aware of the five other accounts she had hidden. If there had been laws like this in place, I would have gotten those pop-up notifications: Your daughter's watching these suicide videos. Your daughter's looking at this. If I had been aware, I might have been able to save her.

My family was torn apart by this tragedy, and we are still trying to pick up the pieces. I got so much ridicule, and I got judged so hard on how I should have been a better mother, I should have watched her more closely. But unfortunately, without any of these laws in place, I was not able to watch her every move. But if there was something in place saying again, your daughter has this, your daughter is watching this, I could have monitored her a lot better. Even her creating a fake account and putting in a birthday that said she was 18 and there not being any verification—that would have been huge. Thank you for taking the time to hear me out today and thank you for allowing Victoria and I and her sister Mei Mei to be here today.

Attorney General Ford:

Before I have Mark Krueger testify, I want to be clear on something. This is a horrible story and it makes people cry. Mei Mei is Victoria's sister. I want to be clear we did not seek out this testimony. Bethany Farris saw that my office was undertaking the effort to engage with and hold social media accountable for the detrimental impacts it has on mental health of children. She reached out to my office and asked to be engaged in this conversation as painful as it is.

She is but one example of what we hear about and what we know about. As difficult as it has been to bring this bill before you to get into a position where we think it should be passed, it is well worth the fight. We will continue to work as much as you require us to get it over the finish line. I want you to understand how important we believe this bill is. With that, we will spend the last few minutes we have of our time to allow Mark to go through the elements of the bill as amended.

Mark J. Krueger, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Consumer Counsel, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Office of the Attorney General:

I will briefly go through the provisions of the bill. I will try to keep it high-level, and if you have any questions, of course, I am ready to answer them. Section 2 of the bill titles it the Nevada Youth Online Safety Act. Sections 3 to 11 provide definitions for this legislation.

I would like to highlight section 4.5 because that provides the definition for a covered digital platform and includes exclusions for those definitions. Notably, some of those exclusions are electronic mail, text messages, videoconferencing, teleconferencing, cloud storage, educational instructional materials, tech support, employment opportunities and career development, news, sports and entertainment, employer/employee communications, and telehealth, in addition to social gaming and gambling-type products.

Section 12 of the bill ensures the legislation only applies to the state of Nevada. Sections 13 through 17 were deleted by amendment. Section 18 prohibits digital platforms from using personal information of a minor in an algorithmic recommendation system unless that data is being used to affirmatively prevent content or advertising prohibited by law. Examples of this are alcohol, tobacco, cannabis products, and things like that. It also allows contextual information delivery and provides definitions for these terms.

Section 19 requires digital platforms to set up guardrails—these are the guardrails Attorney General Ford was talking about—that can be toggled off or on and disabled or enabled at the request of the parent or guardian for the minor user account. These features include primarily infinite scrolling, which the bill defines as limiting the amount of content to six discrete items or seven minutes of continuous content, and the display of interactive metrics, icons, or emoticons, such as likes, shares, et cetera; videos that play automatically without being clicked on; and finally, functions that allow a user or advertiser to broadcast live video content in real time.

Section 20 requires digital platforms to either establish safeguards to limit the amount of time minors use and the hour of day in which the digital platforms send notifications. And it requires them to be reasonable, or alternatively refrain from sending notifications to minor users between certain hours of the day during the school year and certain times at night. It also establishes guardrails for parents and guardians to toggle off notices during those same school hours or during certain times of the night.

Section 21 provides that a violation of the act is a violation of the Deceptive Trade Practices Act and subjects those penalties. Section 23 incorporates the data privacy and protection provisions of the children's data from the Virginia legislation, HB 707. As Attorney General Ford indicated, those are incorporated into sections 24 through 35 of the Act. Sections 24 through 30 provide definitions for those sections. Section 32 provides exclusions for the applicability of those sections, and section 33 requires consent of a parent or guardian before processing personal data of a child under the age of 13. It also prohibits processing of a child's data for targeted advertising, selling personal data of the child, and profiling the child, or for any other purpose that is not reasonably necessary and limited in duration. It requires disclosure before processing a child's data. It also prohibits geolocating data of a child without disclosure.

Section 34 requires controls that offer products or services to a child. Controllers are the definition of the data platforms that are used in the first part of the bill. It also provides the ability of the Attorney General to receive the data protection assessment, which is created as part of the controller's duty under the bill. Section 35 provides for enforcement by the Attorney General.

Finally, section 36 is standard for the nonpublic information, and sections 37 and 38 provide for the effective dates of the bill.

Chair Marzola:

I want to say thank you for being here, and Ms. Farris, I cannot imagine what you have gone through, so please know that my heart goes out to you. Thank you for being a voice, for being here, and being in the Senate telling your story, because the more we hear it, the better it is, and you are making a huge difference. I agree with Attorney General Ford. I think protecting children should always be in our forefront, whether you are a parent or not. If we are going to protect them, we should protect them on all sorts of platforms. With that, we will start questions with Assemblymember Miller.

Assemblymember Miller:

I, of course, echo the Chair's sentiments, and I am so sorry your baby is not here. I am a teacher and I see just how horrific the damage done to our kids mentally, socially, academically, and of course, to their safety, their attention spans, everything. In fact, at my school, when we heard this year the funding may run out for Chromebooks, most of the teachers were celebrating. Please get them out of our schools.

I have been on that side with my students, too, where we have lost students to suicide because of the Internet, because of the pressure of being a teenage influencer, or because of the other students bullying and constantly telling them to do something.

I was also on a police officer ride-along the moment a SafeVoice hit came in and said this kid, at this house right now at 11:00 p.m. on a Saturday, is researching "how do I kill myself." I said this in a hearing the other day: I am a strong advocate of the First Amendment, but I am also way conservative when it comes to our kids.

Unlike library books, where kids have the ability to walk by them, or not choose them, or put them back if they get uncomfortable, the Internet and social media pump things out to us we do not want to see. Once it is in there, it is in there. Again, none of us had to grow up with the pressure or the risk of the Internet. If I had time, I would tell everyone what happened when I gave my students a 30-day, no social media challenge. By day 3, I saw new kids walking in the door celebrating and excited about, Oh, I made all these new friends and we have done all these great things. They were different kids when they were allowed to be kids again.

Attorney General, this bill is very robust and you have covered as many angles as you possibly could. Was there any consideration given to empowering the schools with the ability to say with these school-issued, paid-for Chromebooks, it is only supposed to be used for school activities and academics, but we can see everything they are doing. It is definitely not to empower the schools to literally lock down on these devices and our ability as educators or anyone working with the youth—nonprofits, coaches, or anyone who is there to protect youth—to also make reports. How would we make reports to your office when such things are in violation because again, we are mandated reporters?

Attorney General Ford:

Thank you so much, Assemblymember Miller. I appreciate the conversation, and I appreciate the questions. I will say one of the exceptions we made to some of the prohibitions is in the educational setting, meaning to the extent educational institutions are allowing it, they can maintain and have whatever requirements they would like to. If you have particular restrictions on the use of Chromebooks and apps being on them, this does not negatively affect that. In fact, I think it empowers you even more because it does not require you to consider additional restrictions on how it may interplay with this particular bill. I think that is a partial response to your first question.

What I will say about reporting is we have a survey on our web page right now where people can fill out a survey to interact with us on the ways they are interacting with what they are hearing about in a social media context. We also have a consumer protection line that may or may not be able to be completely useful, but it certainly gets to us, and we can direct folks to the right arena; oftentimes when they give us a phone call. Those are a couple of answers I can provide to you. I want to ask my colleague, Mark Krueger, Chief of Consumer Protection, if he has any additional things to add.

Mark Krueger:

Thank you for your comments. They are spot on and are the exact same comments we have heard not only from teachers, but every single person who interacts with youth, including parents and guardians. There is no shortage of these types of comments. As Attorney General Ford said, we do have a survey where you can input additional comments, and we always do take complaints. If you want to submit them, we will certainly review them.

Assemblymember Miller:

My next question was about the timing because I saw in the bill you did have certain restraints from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., typical school hours, and then 12:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. I was just wondering if there was consideration of 12:00 a.m. A lot of kids are in bed before midnight. What was the consideration as to why it was so late and maybe not earlier in the evening.

Attorney General Ford:

It is funny because Mark is testifying to me; that is what I want to change. Sorry, I made him stick with 12:00 a.m. We started the conversation in those arenas. We have seen other iterations of these efforts, and we tried to pick, generally speaking—because kids might work, for example, and maybe there is some need for them to be up at that time. We were trying to be responsive to those different types of variables in the arena. I want to remind folks these are parental choice toggles. A parent can go in and say, I do not want my kid getting notifications between 12:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. Some platforms that were here to testify already have these types of things available, where you can say you can only be on for an hour, irrespective of what time it is during the day. This bill requires the options of school hours and 12:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. to have the ability to be toggled on and off relative to what these platforms offer for their children and their teens.

Assemblymember Yurek:

Mr. Attorney General, it is always good to see you, sir. And I have to tell you how much I appreciate your bringing a bill like this to address what is a very significant concern I think everybody on this dais can appreciate. Ma'am, I am so sorry to hear your story, and I thank you for the courage you have demonstrated to come and tell that story to help us put a real-life experience to the challenges we are trying to hit at here.

My question, Mr. Attorney General, is again, while understanding what I think the intent is here, widespread, my question comes in section 4.5, specifically on the definition of covered digital platforms. I am assuming specifically on what is not included, and that is going to be on paragraphs (c) and (d) under subsection 2. It looks like it is excluding some of the online gaming platforms like Roblox; that is the one I keep hearing. I do not know if that would be covered under this but, as I understand it, those include social interactions and user-generated content in-game purchases. I have even gone online and seen there are online parental platforms about these types of games. They appear to be excluded in here, so on the record, can you tell us if these types of platforms are excluded in your bill? If so, what would be the purpose of excluding those platforms?

Attorney General Ford:

Assemblymember Yurek, they are not excluded. The phraseology relative to gaming was Nevada-type gaming—gambling, so to speak. We have a gaming definition under section 4.7. A gaming licensee has a meaning ascribed to licensee in *Nevada Revised Statutes* 463.0171. So online games and gamers are different from gaming. We were trying to accommodate the gaming component, and it has caused confusion, so let me clear that up right now.

Chair Marzola:

My colleague asked one of my questions. I want to confirm—and I may not use the correct lingo—if you are playing a video game, you have these chat rooms. I want to make sure we were not excluding them, whether it is Roblox or if you are at home on your game console.

Mark Krueger:

Under the definition of a cover digital platform, gamer gaming platforms are not excluded. However, there is a provision that allows certain online gaming to have the ability to talk that does not get covered by the content included in section 19. There is a little leeway for some of those gamer gaming type platforms. I get mixed up between the two as far as how to say it. They are not excluded specifically from the bill.

Chair Marzola:

If I can follow up on that, when you say it gives them a little leeway, what does that mean?

Mark Krueger:

Chair, under section 19, those are the guardrails we were speaking about that get to be put up. Two of the guardrails have a provision about content, and it excludes those particular guardrails from the content definition. That is how they have a little bit of wiggle room in section 19.

In the gaming world, when they are gaming online they are able to chat in real-time in the game itself. It is part of the gameplay, if you will; it is a component of the gameplay. They are allowed to continue to do the chatting in the gameplay and the parents do not have the opportunity to toggle that off and on, so that would be permitted. Presumably, if parents were wanting them not to be part of that gameplay piece they would either say, You cannot participate in that part of the game, or they would not let them play the game, if that helps.

Chair Marzola:

It does, but I guess my confusion is why are we excluding that? Why are we not putting safeguards in when it comes to these chat rooms? It is my understanding I can be 10 years old; I am playing a game, I have a headset on, and I can be speaking to a 40- or 50-year-old. Things can happen and tend to happen. I understand we are trying to protect children; what I do not understand is why we are protecting them in some spaces but not all.

Attorney General Ford:

I think the most contextual answer to provide in that regard is it is not perfect but it is a step in the right direction in my estimation. It was an intent to compromise to move the bill forward. But I will say this. If this Committee so desires, you can exclude them. What I present to you is the compromise legislation we were able to come to, having had over a dozen folks opposing this. Moving them all to neutral, with the exception of, to my knowledge, two entities and two industry groups to which they belong. It is not perfect. Former Assemblymember Maggie Carlton used to say all the time, do not let the "perfect be the enemy of the good." This is a step in the right direction in my estimation. That is the truthful response about that.

Assemblymember Anderson:

I would agree with you. Ms. Farris, I am so sorry for you and also for your daughter; the loss is huge. As you know, I am a high school teacher. I am wondering why in one section of the bill, I think it is section 5, it speaks about a minor who is less than 18 years of age, and then it changes in section 25 to utilize child. Why is it not consistent? I am so happy one of my colleagues brought up the hours because most of my students, who I am missing right now, are usually scrolling between the hours of 12:30 a.m. and 3:30 a.m., and then I cannot figure out why they are asleep in my class—because my class is awesome, everybody would be very excited to be in my class for those of you who are laughing. Why is it not consistent as a minor under the age of 18?

Attorney General Ford:

I am giggling again because Mark Krueger told me to change that too. What happened was, this is a very real response. When we were negotiating this bill, I was told by the working group if I were to simply adopt the Virginia-based bill, everybody would have been fine. I would have had no opposition. Everybody was cool with Virginia. But I do not want Virginia, I want a Virginia-plus. What you have before you is a Virginia-plus bill. The Virginia bill started at age 13 and that is why we have age 13 under that particular provision. I am a man of my word. I did not want to try to take the Virginia bill, apply it to the entirety of my bill, and make it 18-years of age and under because I thought that would have been disingenuous. Frankly, it would have opened up the door for people to come in and say, I did not agree to that, and I am now moved from neutral back to opposition. What you see again is the quintessential example of compromise legislation where I agreed to the Virginia bill, which incorporated 13 years of age. But the plus part is my bill initially started with 18 years of age and under.

Assemblymember Anderson:

The follow up is how much I appreciate section 19. The fact you are making it very clear if there is a continual scrolling of, what is it seven, I think it was—I cannot remember now how many—that is going to hit where somebody is going to be contacted right away, I believe is the intent and I think that is in section 19. I just want to make sure that is what the intent of section 19 is when it is the number of times other users have shared, liked, or continually clicked. I just want to make sure I have that right.

Mark Krueger:

Section 19 does limit the infinite scrolling of content to six discrete items or seven minutes of continuous content. Remember, section 19 is the guardrail, so it is the point at which parents or guardians can request this be turned off, or they can go on themselves and toggle it off. We left that to the platforms to figure it out. They can turn it off for their minor user or turn it back on for their minor user, as they see fit. There is no notification requirement under the bill, but that does not mean platforms could not build that in as well, and we would encourage platforms to do so. But it does put the power back on the parents to be able to turn these features off or on as they see fit for their children's use of the platforms.

Assemblymember Hardy:

Ma'am, thank you for being here. My heart breaks for you, as a mother myself, and for your family. I appreciate you sharing your story in hopes this will prevent this from happening to somebody else's child. It is a sad fact of the world we live in that we even have to talk about this, but it is the world, and we have to face it and do what we can to try and protect our children. My question is a perfect segue from my colleagues here about the parent involvement. I am just wondering how that would work? How would you verify it is an actual parent? Is this the parents getting the phone and turning it off, or are they notifying the platform they want to receive the notifications? There is a conversation of kids putting in different birth dates, saying they are 18 years of age or older. How are you going to know it is a real parent making the request?

Mark Krueger:

When we were writing this legislation, what we did not want to do was step on the platform's ability to function and verify ages if they wanted to or on how they would do it. We knew parents could reach out. If parents reached out and put the platform on notice that it was their child they wanted to have controls over, then the platforms have the ability to do that. They currently all have the ability to do that because they have teen accounts; they have minor accounts. If they know that and discover a child is under the age of 13, they are required by federal law to do affirmative conduct to get consent, things like that. They are all very aware of how to go about doing it. What we did not want to do was constrain them to, You must do X, Y, and Z.

We had age verification here originally, and we agreed to pull it out. In so doing, even when we had it in, we did not say, This is the type of age verification. We just had it; it must be age verification up to 95 percent accurate. At this point in time, we would leave it up to the platforms to decide how they want to determine if it is an actual parent reaching in and saying, Yes, I want to turn off the conduct of these restrictions for my children. I would note one other little thing. Because these are restrictions that you can toggle off, it does not make a lot of sense for a child to pretend to sign on and go, Yeah, I want to turn off my restrictions or my friend's restrictions. That is not what they are trying to do because children—as all the teachers here and I talked about today—tend to be hooked and want more time on the platform. That is what the platforms are designed to do. I hope that answers your question.

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett:

Thank you so much for bringing this piece of legislation and for joining us to testify on this bill. Obviously, working with kids, I definitely see the impact social media has. My question is in regard to what laws have you seen in other states. It seems to be the Virginia law is the law that has stood up to any legal challenges. I am wondering if you could address how this is different from that or what some of the differences are and why.

Attorney General Ford:

A couple of responses, and then I am going to kick it to Mr. Krueger. This is Virginia-plus. Everything in the Virginia bill is in this bill. That is the privacy component Virginia passed. I will note, when the Governor of Virginia received this bill from his Legislature, they said, I am going to sign it, but it does not go far enough. They essentially wanted Virginia-plus. They wanted to be able to require age verification and a few additional things, but all they could do was compromise and not let the "perfect be the enemy of the good," so they have Virginia, which is the reason why, and it was approved. They subsequently did amend the Virginia bill on May 2, 2025, to add additional protections. Again, being true to my word, I did not incorporate the updated amendments to the Virginia bill that were adopted on May 2, 2025. We are sticking with the May 17, 2024, version in this bill. The plus component is the toggle on and off ability and the guardrails we have talked about, infinite scrolling, the metrics, and things of that sort. There have been other bills similar to this that have withstood scrutiny as well; Arkansas comes to mind. But again, I do not want to misspeak, so I am going to give that question to Mr. Krueger.

Mark Krueger:

Unfortunately, I did not bring the document with me today. I neglected to do so, and I apologize. What our team did was we looked at all of the legislation that had either been passed or is pending in the United States on addressing these very same issues, and there is a lot of it. Our team put together a voluminous packet that outlined all of it. Then what we did was we took a different legislation, and we said, What is happening to it? Is it being challenged, and if it is being challenged, is it surviving the challenge? We wanted to write our law very carefully so we would avoid those First Amendment issues. We avoided talking about or limiting content; you will not find that in this bill. We feel very confident the challenges, when they do come, and they will, this bill will survive judicial scrutiny. I can certainly give additional information about what bills have withstood judicial scrutiny following this Committee hearing.

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett:

My questions are in regard to section 19 and whether or not these are evidence-based approaches to improving our use of social media; specifically, because I think there are other ways parents can do this. I have a good friend who has a daughter in high school and she used her service provider, T-Mobile, AT&T, or whatever it was, to control their phone use and what times they shut off, what apps were available at what times of the day, and when they could open it. It seems to me there are ways for parents to do this now, and the actual issue is education. Making sure our families know these are ways you can support your student or your child with healthy social media use or what good digital citizenship looks like—it seems like that is the larger issue. I have families in my office regularly when I am back in Las Vegas because their student is using social media inappropriately. We are educating the parent on what they can do to support their child with good social media usage and how they can help make sure their student does not have access to this technology at certain times of the day. I understand the issue, but it seems to me there is a bigger education concern. I do not see this bill solving that much of a larger issue because even if this were all available, my students are smart, they are going to say they are 20 years old, and they are going to create these accounts. How do we actually do something to ensure parents understand? This creates a policy for the apps, but I think what you are going to see is kids are going to create accounts by saying they are 19.

Attorney General Ford:

I do not disagree with much of what you said. There is no doubt there are other ways in which to address some of these, and there is, in fact, a larger education issue to take place. I learned a long time ago we cannot solve every ill with one piece of legislation. I do not purport this bill is going to solve the larger communications issue, but it does provide an additional tool parents can utilize to see what else may be out there.

You are right, folks are smart. Predators have been smart as well. They have gotten into these apps and figured out a way to lure these kids. That was the first prong I talked about, cutting down on predators, protecting the privacy, and then protecting the mental health component. There is a tripartite approach here. Yes, children are smart, and they are going to look for ways to get around the law.

I have said this twice this session: there is not a law on the books, Assemblymember, that people do not try to get around. Everyone tries to get around. We have traffic laws, but people still run red lights. At the end of the day, we still have to try to operate in a way that is going to put up safeguards and protect, in this instance, some of the most vulnerable folks in our communities, the youth. We are keeping up with technology. Speaking of traffic, I said before as well, we did not need traffic laws until the cars were created. We did not need these types of tools until social media came into being and the digital platforms were created. We are trying to keep up with technology and provide parents additional tools out there to protect their children from predators online, to protect their privacy, and to protect their mental health.

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett:

Going back to my first question, is there any evidence the items listed in section 19 support those goals? That is what I have not seen. I have heard the anecdotal—we will if we cut down on scrolling that supports, but I want to know, is there any data-based evidence that supports that.

Attorney General Ford:

The short answer is, absolutely. There is empirical evidence, there is quantitative evidence, there is qualitative evidence, there is PhD-based evidence. There are scholars who testify in this particular arena all the time. There are articles that come out. In fact, there is a *Washington Post* article we were going to share about some of the problems we are seeing in that particular regard. We did not bring any of that literature, but we can absolutely supplement the record with research and evidence from folks who opine on these areas. They demonstrate if you are to provide these types of opportunities for parents to get engaged and to limit their children's experiences with these platforms, then it is going to increase. You have heard Assemblymember Miller say that after three days, kids were coming in and behaving differently. I know that is anecdotal, but the point I am making is, there are certainly others out there who have demonstrated and researched this and can come back and support the contingent we are putting forth that this will be helpful.

Assemblymember Yeager:

Ms. Farris, I want to thank you for being here and sharing your personal experience with a room full of strangers. I just appreciate the courage it takes to frame this issue. Before my question, I have just a little bit of a soapbox to get on, and I apologize, Attorney General; I missed the beginning of your presentation. I go back and forth in my mind about whether the advent of social media has been a net negative or a net positive for society. I know one thing is clear to me. I think probably the greatest failing of the last 20 or 25 years is that we did not realize what social media would do to our youth.

This data targeting we as adults feels oppressive sometimes. I cannot look at something without getting served up a bunch of the same ads, the second I spend five seconds looking at one of them. To think our youth have a chance to even process that when their brains are not mature, I think we really have utterly failed as a society. We should have gotten ahead of this. We cannot go back in time. I applaud you for trying to address the problem as we find it

today. It is an extraordinarily complex problem today because we have companies that have built back-end infrastructure. They are very good at what they do; they know what you want to see, and they will give you more and more of it. A lot of it is based on their wanting to sell you products, and they want you to look at advertisements. That is the monetization of social media, and I get that as a business construct, but we have to protect our most vulnerable. That is the soapbox.

The thank you is for working on this issue. The question is this one. As you might imagine, I have received quite a few inquiries and quite a few meetings about this bill, mostly from folks who do not like the bill much the way it is now. I just want to ask you to address one of the claims I have heard, and that is this: Some of the online companies we are talking about have developed their own tools for young users and vulnerable users to try to make sure they are not seeing harmful content. We know what the illegal content is they can see, but there is other content that could be harmful given the context.

The argument that has been made to me is some of their back-end processes actually help and your bill is going to prevent them from using those. I know I am not using the correct terminology, but the back-end infrastructure they use to make sure harmful content is not being seen might not necessarily be de facto harmful content. So, long question, but if you could just address that for me, in terms of how you would respond to that particular argument, I would really appreciate it.

Attorney General Ford:

Let me say a couple of points, the first of which is that we worked all the way up until the 115-day session with people who did not like the bill. I would hope, based on the conversations I have had with every single one of these folks who claim to be in opposition, they did not mislead me into thinking they were going to be in neutral on this side and then come to you. If you have had more than four conversations with folks, okay, hallelujah. That is what I would hope because we have worked diligently to address all these issues. We gave the industry an opportunity to bring me something I could consider that would fulfill the three prongs I have mentioned to you. They brought me Virginia, which did not accomplish that. Here is where we are: we have continued conversation back and forth with language they might be able to present to us that would accommodate my concerns without moving folks out of neutral and back into opposition. There have been some very genuine, good-faith discussions back and forth, but we have not been able to come to an agreement on that.

Your question is about content, Assemblymember Yeager. This bill is not about content; it does not touch content. One of the reasons why is because we do not want to be accused of abridging the First Amendment. We have seen what happened in California and other places where they have purported to address bad content. What we are doing is operating in a manner of time, place, and manner of the delivery of content. Irrespective of how they want to characterize what they are presenting to their users, this bill applies equally. If what they are doing is beneficial, in their estimation, from a content perspective, God bless them. That is not anything this bill purports to address, wants to address, or can even address in a way we feel comfortable trying to defend in the First Amendment context.

That said, these provisions are again parental opt-in. If they are already operating in a way that is protecting youth by limiting time, for example, by allowing a parent to come in and say—you can only be on a . . . they are already complying at some level. Some of these things, I will not call them disingenuous, but I would call them kind of red herrings at some level. Frankly, that is being tied to the sponsor [unintelligible]. We would not delve into the content these entities are providing their youth. What we know, back to Assemblymember Torres-Fossett's question, is that empirical research, quantitative research, and qualitative research have, in fact, said if you limit screen time and if you provide opportunities like these, we can protect mental health.

Evidence in our own office shows predation will go down if we are able to affect some of the things we are talking about. The privacy components we are talking about, I think, are also as important. That is my response to your question, Assemblymember Yeager.

If I may, my Chief of Staff, Teresa Benitez-Thompson, has something to offer as well.

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

To answer the questions about the teen and youth accounts that are being built, there is research still coming out on that. A lot of them are very new; one of the biggest entities out there who set up teen accounts, set those up in September 2024, so just this last fall.

There was a *Washington Post* article [[Exhibit I](#)], I think about a week and a half ago or two weeks ago, we can share with you where there are studies being conducted to look at the efficacy of those accounts and what is happening with those accounts. A lot of reports are saying harmful content is still getting through. A lot of that is based on different companies and different companies' policies.

We have a lot of data on this, and we did not want to turn this into a study thing, but one of the things we talk about—this was an article from January 7, 2025, so just this past January, about some of the big platforms. We are not naming specific platforms; we did not want to do that. In some specific platforms their guidelines allow for—and this particular company mentioned, We do allow allegations of mental illness or abnormality when based on gender or sexual orientation given political and religious discourse about transgenderism and homosexuality and common on serious usages of the word like weird. We see their policies across platforms are going to allow for different types of content, and that is why section 19, for parents to decide what they think is appropriate for their child to be exposed to when they go into the social media platforms is going to be that important. Those teen accounts may or may not be effective, they may or may not be working, and they may or may not change over the course of the first year; the companies might change their approach. We certainly want section 19 to give us some of these important features, and we want them in statute.

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, any additional questions?

Assemblymember Kasama:

Ms. Farris, I echo all my colleagues' comments for your courage to come here. Thank you so much for sharing your story. I think we all know this is such a huge issue. We are all frightened by it and want to protect our children. I have grandchildren too, now. It is a frightening world we have come to, as Assemblymember Yeager said. How do we address all of this? I believe there was a United States Surgeon General who said, All children should not even have cell phones [*sic*] until they are 16 years old. I heard that, and I was thinking it would be great if we all had the courage as parents and society to make sure that happened because I think limiting the use is the big thing, and how do we help parents control it?

Along the same lines as some of my colleagues' questions, in section 19.3 we are excluding the interactive video game, and I know we talked about it. I just have great concerns because there are new games, there are new apps, and there are new things that come out all the time, and it seems like unless we address this as an all-or-nothing, picking certain areas would not solve the loophole. Just a question for your consideration.

Mark Krueger:

When we originally had this bill, we did not have these particular exclusions in here, and through negotiations, we did provide that, just as it goes to certain content that is necessary. If you look at section 19, subsection 3, "As used in this section, 'content' does not include any content, material or other media that is generated by or within an interactive video game which is necessary for or incidental to the use and enjoyment of the interactive video game." The negotiations were essentially, "Let us try to get something passed." The video games, the way they operate, allow for this interaction as you are playing the game as opposed to some of the other platforms where it is a singular interaction with yourself. Yes, you can like things like that. I would note, though, only the two provisions that talk about content would exclude video, not the other two provisions, so parents would still be able to toggle on and off for the other two provisions. It is negotiations.

Attorney General Ford:

I want to offer one more response to Assemblymember Torres-Fossett. You mentioned the Surgeon General, Assemblymember Kasama, and it reminded me that, in fact, the Surgeon General has issued a warning on social media. He has said he is advocating for warning labels on social media platforms similar to those on tobacco. There is plenty of research that talks about the concerns and issues. Her question was specific to the efficacy of what the solutions are we are proposing, but we also think it is important to note the overall problem and indicate as well that we have research that indicates the proposals we have here are also sufficient, or at least a step in the right direction.

Assemblymember Yurek:

I just want to go on record to say I really do not appreciate the technical answer to my question earlier; it seemed like you were skirting the issue a little bit. Particularly with the follow-up with the Chair and my colleague just now, it does sound like in negotiations, you were excluding the very company I was talking about from the protections this bill affords. I just wanted to note that for the record. On top of that, I guess hearing

Ms. Benitez-Thompson just indicate in section 19 there is an effort to offer some parental controls, letting them pick and choose some of these protection measures. Can you give me an idea of why the time frames specifically listed here that some of my other colleagues have brought up? Could parents pick different time frames? Can you just clarify that for me?

Attorney General Ford:

I want to be certain I understood what your contention was, Assemblymember Yurek. Roblox is not out of this bill. Let me make it quite clear, Roblox, you are not out of this bill. If you thought you were, you are not out of this bill. There may very well have been some contention—Mr. Yurek, I do not lie, and I do not misrepresent. Sitting at this desk, I would not look you in your face and tell you something I did not believe was true. Roblox is not out of this bill; they are in this bill. There is absolutely a compromise that has taken place, but none of that has led to the contention they are out of this bill from my perspective. I just want to clear it up because I felt as though that was an affront toward me, and I needed to be able to address that directly. We also do not purport to try to give technical answers to skirt questions. Anybody who knows me, knows I am going to tell you directly. I am not skirting anything. I am going to tell you exactly what the truth is about these issues and speak to it from our perspective. I am sorry, I just need to clarify that. The second question you asked, you will have to remind me so I can respond.

Assemblymember Yurek:

With the time frame controls that are listed in section 19, do the parents have the freedom to pick and choose different time frames outside of this? Is it a possibility for the parents to choose different time frames that work for their kids and their family?

Mark Krueger:

Assemblymember Yurek, I understand the question. There is no restriction on digital platforms from making different time frames available for parents to decide. The only time frames required by the statute are those enumerated in the statute, which are in the proposed legislation and would be the time frames during the school year and the evening or nighttime frames they can toggle on and off. The legislation does say, The social digital platforms shall, in an effort to make reasonable limitations on time frames. It does provide them and encourages them to try to even restrict those time frames even more under the reasonableness standard.

Attorney General Ford:

There are other ways in which parents can currently engage on time frames, and this does not exclude them from being able to do that, whether it is on the platform level, the phone level, or whatever the case may be. This is just what is required under this bill as an option provided to parents.

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, any additional questions? [There were none.] We will start with support testimony for S.B. 63 (R1). Is there anyone in Carson City? You may begin when you are ready.

Carissa Pearce, Government Affairs Manager, Children's Advocacy Alliance:

I am here representing Children's Advocacy Alliance and we are in support of this bill.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of S.B. 63 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line?

Deborah Earl, Chief Operating Officer and Vice President, Power2Parents, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Power2Parents is a nonprofit dedicated to defending parental rights and empowering families. I am here today in strong support of S.B. 63 (R1), the Nevada Youth Online Safety Act, because it restores what should not be up for debate: a parent's right to protect their child online.

We know social media platforms are engineered to keep users, especially children, engaged. This bill gives parents a way to interrupt addictive and potentially dangerous online habits by allowing them to disable late-night addictive scrolling and auto-play features on their child's account. This bill does not ban platforms, and it does not limit free speech. What it does is give parents a vital tool to safeguard their children's mental health, privacy, and time. It allows parents to say, No more notifications at 2:00 a.m. or, My child does not need algorithm-driven content that tracks and profiles them. Senate Bill 63 (1st Reprint) recognizes parents, not tech companies, should decide how and when their children interact with the digital world. It aligns with existing federal law, strengthens parental oversight, and introduces much-needed accountability for these platforms. On behalf of thousands of families across Nevada, I urge you to support S.B. 63 (R1). Let us give parents the authority they need to protect kids in the digital age.

[[Exhibit J](#) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Chair Marzola:

We will move to testimony in opposition to S.B. 63 (R1). Is there anyone here in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition? You may begin when you are ready.

Aodhan Downey, State Policy Manager West, Computer & Communications Industry Association:

We appreciate the amendments adopted by Attorney General Ford which reflect an effort to improve S.B. 63 (R1). However, we still have significant concerns about the bill's overall impact on free expression, access to information, and the potential for unintended consequences.

While the Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA) strongly supports efforts to enhance online safety and privacy for children, the bill's provision will fail to make young people safer. There are significant concerns about excluding young people from critical support spaces, especially those from underserved or marginalized communities.

Additionally, S.B. 63 (R1) includes vague and subjective language, which has compliance requirements based on what platforms reasonably believe or variable definitions that depend on undefined context. These ambiguities create legal uncertainty and risk arbitrary enforcement. The language also makes it uncertain how a covered entity would have to verify the parent of a minor either has the person's best interest in mind or could potentially be a bad actor looking to harm the user experience online. Covered entities will err on the side of caution and unnecessarily place restrictions on accounts that are not the target of the bill. Instead of imposing rigid mandates that may not survive legal scrutiny, CCIA encourages the legislature to support collaborative efforts between industry and policymakers.

Many platforms already offer robust tools that allow parents to set time limits and filter content to protect the children's privacy without denying access to beneficial online communities and resources. A recent study by the Family Online Safety Institute found more than four in five households using different types of existing parental controls found them effective in protecting children online. Thank you for considering these comments. The CCIA respectfully urges the Committee to reconsider S.B. 63 (R1) in its current form and work toward solutions that protect children without undermining constitutional rights and restricting access to the digital world they rely on. [Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit K](#).]

Jose Torres Casillas, Deputy Executive Director, California and Southwest Region, TechNet:

TechNet is the national bipartisan network of technology executives representing over 100 companies. We have been and remain respectfully opposed to S.B. 63 (R1). Children's privacy and security are a priority for our member companies, and they have been at the forefront of raising the standard for teen safety and privacy across our industry by creating new features, settings, and protections that are age-appropriate and tailored to the various developmental needs.

Our members, for example, use personalized recommendations and algorithmic curation to rank and organize online content into something manageable and usable to provide an age-appropriate experience. However, S.B. 63 (R1) would ban the use of algorithmic curations, and it would hinder our ability to provide a safe and age-appropriate experience. With algorithmic curation, not only is content that is helpful or interesting being prioritized, but content that is not age-appropriate is being deprioritized for teen or minor accounts. Preventing personalized recommendations would cause more harm as companies would be limited in their ability to identify and block content that is not age-appropriate for teen or minor accounts.

Additionally, on disabling various settings, we oppose creating a mandated one-size-fits-all approach. This undermines the role of parents in managing the children's online experience. Our companies have rolled out various features and continue to create additional features. They also provide resources such as dedicated websites to help inform and educate parents about the various parental control tools available to them so they have the flexibility to make

the best decisions for their family's online presence. As such, we appreciate engaging with the Attorney General, but we remain opposed to this bill. [Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit L](#).]

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

To be very quick, we are looking forward to being able to move off opposition and to neutral on this. We are very encouraged that the Attorney General has looked at other states regarding online child privacy. We have a couple of areas where we think the Virginia language we had agreed to was not carried over 100 percent. We believe there is some language that looks like it could be a private right of action, in this language, that is, it is not included in Virginia.

There are a couple of exemptions found in Virginia that are not included in this language, and there is a definition of consumer device that also was not included in the Virginia language. We are trying to work through that; we understand the time very quickly. We hope to be able to address those issues and move into neutral but, at the moment, we are opposed.

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

The Vegas Chamber has been consistently opposed to S.B. 63 (R1). We have, of course, met at the Attorney General's office and with his staff. We do appreciate a lot of the developments that have occurred with the bill. But unfortunately, we do have members who still have significant concerns.

As you know, this organization is a state's largest and broadest, and we are talking about social media and platforms, and what that means is we have to see from a wide angle what that means for their operations and those intents.

We do appreciate the efforts of the Attorney General to get where we are today, but at this time, the Chamber is still opposed, and we do hope any additional clarification of the Virginia language may remove that opposition.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 63 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line to testify in opposition?

Amy Bos, Director, State and Federal Affairs, NetChoice:

NetChoice shares the laudable goal of protecting Nevada's children online, but we must respectfully urge you to oppose S.B. 63 (R1) as it would undermine both constitutional protections and effective child safety measures already deployed by our industry. Although the amended version removes age verification requirements, which courts have consistently struck down, significant First Amendment violations remain.

The algorithmic restrictions, arbitrary time restrictions, and notification prohibitions constitute content-based regulations that trigger strict constitutional scrutiny. Federal courts have consistently struck down similar provisions earlier this year in *NetChoice v. Bonta*, of the Ninth Circuit, permanently joining California's similar law, finding that requiring platforms to modify features for minors likely burdens the right to speak anonymously and imposes unconstitutional content-based restrictions. Our members have implemented comprehensive safety measures, including robust content moderation, extensive parental controls, and proactive harmful content removal. These voluntary initiatives make significant steps to protecting children while preserving constitutional rights. Again, we respectfully urge the Committee to reject S.B. 63 (R1).

Nicole Lopez, Director and Associate General Counsel, Global Litigation Strategy, Meta Platforms, Inc.:

I am a former prosecutor, former head of E-safety policy, and now a director for legal strategy at Meta Platforms, Inc. I am also a parent of twins. This Committee should oppose S.B. 63 (R1). While we share the same goal to make online experiences safer for teens, this bill undermines our existing safety efforts and parental controls, and it is likely to be found unconstitutional. At Meta, we are working to make sure teens have age-appropriate experiences, and we are empowering parents to support their teens online. That is why we launched teen accounts in 2024, which recognizes a teen's online experience should be different from an adult's. How do we do that? We take a teen's personal information to default them into age-appropriate settings like private accounts, messaging restrictions, content restrictions, and content recommendations, like local high school soccer videos. We also default teams into 60-minute daily limits and mute notifications at night. Parents can further restrict their teen's time by blocking access or muting notifications at certain times.

Senate Bill 63 (1st Reprint) would prevent companies from offering these age-specific safety tools and features because they are built on personalization. In fact, section 18 would only allow personalization to prevent teens from seeing illegal content, but not allow it to prevent teens from seeing content that is perfectly legal but only meant for adults.

Section 19 is equally problematic. Why is it a problem to use seven pieces of content but not six? This arbitrary provision does not solve parent concerns around time spent online. That is what parent supervision tools do.

Courts have recognized the constitutional issues with laws that selectively single out particular speakers or types of speech. Senate Bill 63 (1st Reprint) only targets a small subset of the many apps teens use and has continued to add carve-outs in recent weeks, which we heard the Committee members address directly.

This bill also has an unrealistic effective date. The best path forward is legislation that requires app stores to verify age and get parental consent before teens can download apps. The solution introduced in 19 states and at the federal level—

Chair Marzola:

If you can please wrap up your testimony, your time has ended.

Nicole Lopez:

Yes, I am almost there. It is a solution that has been introduced in 19 states and at the federal level and you may know this has recently been signed into law in Utah. [Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit M](#).]

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else on the line?

Yolanda Knaak, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada:

Please vote no, and I just want to ditto what everyone else said.

[[Exhibit N](#) and [Exhibit O](#) were submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Chair Marzola:

We will move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Attorney General, would you like to give any closing remarks?

Attorney General Ford:

Yes, ma'am. I will not carry on long at all, I promise. Frankly, I appreciate the arguments they are laying out for me to get ready to defend in court.

We clearly disagree this is an unconstitutional act. You have heard them say we overstep constitutional boundaries by limiting the free speech of minors or limiting the free speech of other digital platform users, the targeted youth—cannot be further from the truth. This bill, as amended, places reasonable time, place, and manner of restrictions on how digital platforms have been bombarding our youth with online content that is proven harmful.

The final arbiter of any constitutional challenge is not going to be them or me. It is going to be the courts at the end of the day. We avoided California for the very reason she mentioned. They lost. We did not borrow their language. I will also say we are not placing unreasonable restrictions on these digital platforms relative to content that the minor can experience. In the Senate, we learned many of these companies, even today, are already doing some of these things. It is not unreasonable for them to be able to continue to comply.

For them to claim that covered digital platform is vague, let me be very clear on that point: that is the most fine-tuned provision of this bill. We had a lot of back and forth to determine who was going to be in and who is going to be out and those types of things that were necessary to move the bill forward.

Frankly, the most incredulous contention is to say we overburden parents by pursuing this bill. We are providing parents an opportunity to engage, to the extent they want to. If they want to claim that is a bad move, then guilty as charged.

I will conclude by saying this social media inspires all kinds of conversations. Policymakers, parents, and teachers were all weighing in on the harms and benefits of social media use for our children. Senate Bill 63 (1st Reprint) takes into account research and data on harms while balancing access for kids and gives parents more control to boot. Overall, this bill makes the digital platform safer by requiring digital platforms to enact limits and protections for our youth.

Chair Marzola:

I will now close the hearing on S.B. 63 (R1). We are going to quickly go back into our work session. We have one bill left, Senate Bill 172 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 172 (2nd Reprint): Prescribes certain rights for agricultural workers.
(BDR 53-959)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 172 (2nd Reprint) prescribes certain rights for agricultural workers sponsored by Senator Flores and heard on May 28, 2025 [[Exhibit P](#)]. There are no proposed amendments.

Chair Marzola:

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 172 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 172 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CARTER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBERS COLE, HARDY,
KASAMA, O'NEILL, AND YUREK VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Carter. That ends our work session for today. I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 165 (2nd Reprint). This measure establishes provisions relating to behavioral health. Good afternoon, Senator Nguyen. You may begin when you are ready.

Senate Bill 165 (2nd Reprint): Establishes provisions relating to behavioral health.
(BDR 54-145)

Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen, Senate District No. 3:

I am very excited to be here. I will try to be brief and hopefully answer any questions you might have. At the end of last legislative session, I remember I received a call from my city councilperson Brian Knudsen, and he asked me if I was willing to come over, and it was just across the street at a conference area in a memory care center. He said, We have some space, we are getting together a bunch of people in the room, we are working with the Children's Advocacy Alliance, and we are going to have Dr. Tara Raines—and she might be on Zoom to answer any questions and follow up with the presentation—as well Dr. Michelle Paul from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) was present as well. There were probably about 40 or 50 other practitioners, providers, community advocates, nonprofit organizations, medical and hospital providers, and other people who were sitting in that room. The whole goal of this consortium of people who got together was to figure out what we could do to have a real impact in our state when it came to children's behavioral and mental health.

As we were sitting in there, we were also introduced to the great work at the Ballmer Institute [for Children's Behavioral Health] they were doing in Oregon. In fact, this led to a trip later on in the fall of last year where we had the privilege of going with Senator Lange, as well as Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno, and members from some of these other nonprofits, including Tara Rains, City Councilman Knudson, and members from the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), including UNLV and University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). We brought these folks out to the University of Oregon to see what they are doing out there.

We were able to meet with the teachers, professors, practitioners, and community providers who were involved. This is a very brand-new program they are instituting. We were looking to see what we could do about emulating them and seeing what they were doing at the bachelor's-level degree program. We met with students who were starting their third year in college in this program. In the third and fourth year of college, in addition to classwork—think about doing a practical residency program for a bachelor's level degree—that was embedded in the schools, nonprofit organizations, and some of the crisis stabilization lines for young kids.

We were able to see what they were doing and the partnering they were doing with nonprofits in schools to train people. In addition to coming out with a bachelor's-level degree, they actually came out with a practical residency style type of experience to get into the community and be that change.

They are essentially creating a new profession, and that is what Senate Bill 165 (2nd Reprint) does. It creates a new Nevada-grown workforce to help tackle our mental and behavioral health crisis, especially focusing on children's mental health. It creates a bachelor's-level degree program with appropriations to UNLV, UNR, and Great Basin College. It also creates a new license and allows for new opportunities for people to actually bill for these services once they come out with this career path. This bill also creates a psychology internship

program—think of a psychology residency program. Currently, we had seven graduates from our Ph.D. program at UNLV, for example, and all seven of those graduates had to leave the state of Nevada because there are no internship programs here.

A lot of you are familiar with graduate medical education or residency programs for doctors. To be a psychologist, you also need to have a psychology degree. To be able to do that, you have to do an internship program. In order to have an internship program, you have to have an accredited program, which means you need to fund three of those positions. We do not have a program. We have no internship potential here at all, so we are training Nevadans—they have no other option; they must leave our state. This would create this program just like support for medical residencies. This would create an accredited program to at least ensure we are keeping at least three of those interns here in our state; allowing them to work and train here and stay here in our state.

I could go on and on about this bill. There are certain things—at the end of the day, it is creating this new licensed behavioral health and wellness practitioner. It creates a licensing avenue for them to become licensed and to further define that scope of practice. It also allocates those resources to our universities to be able to create the program that is going to create this workforce.

I have Dr. Raines on Zoom. I think she has a few words to present about her work in this area, and we would not be sitting here today without all the great work she has done in this area. I will turn it over to her with your permission, Chair.

Tara C. Raines, Deputy Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance:

Thank you, Senator Nguyen, for bringing this very important bill forward. We see this as a way to really tackle the workforce shortages we have in Nevada in regard to children's mental health. There is the analogy of the folks who are walking through the forest and they come upon the river, they see babies in the river, and they start taking them out. What we are able to do now with our limited children's mental health workforce is take some of the babies out of the river.

These behavioral health and wellness practitioners allow us to go upstream and see why the kids are falling in the river. It allows us to do prevention-oriented work and early intervention work so we do not have as many youths needing the high-impact, more expensive, and more involved mental health treatment later on down the line.

With regard to what the Senator said about child psychology internships in Nevada, as she highlighted, we are hemorrhaging our students. We train them here, and we are excited to have them here, and they must go to other states to finish their internship and finish their degree with a specialty in children. We hope they come back, but we know many of them do not. We know folks tend to stay where they intern and where they get licensed. We are seeing that as another avenue for growing our children's mental health workforce.

The bachelor's level work is being done across the world. It has been done in the United Kingdom with incredible outcomes for reducing the number of people who have severe mental health disorders. We see this as a natural path and a natural way to really move the needle here in Nevada and support our children and families. I am here for questions if anyone has anything specific.

Senator Nguyen:

I do have one more thing further to highlight, which is I found this statistic was very impactful for me, and hopefully it will be for this Committee as well. To give an example, we heard there were approximately 4,000 bachelor's-level degree graduates in psychology at UNLV. It is obviously a very popular degree. If we could divert even 100 of them, or half of them, or any of them, that is increasing a new workforce. They would be trained and able to go out and do behavioral health and wellness, like preventative-type work, in our communities sooner rather than later. It has the potential for real results very quickly. That was really impactful.

When we talk about nursing programs and opening up 20 extra slots or opening up 3 more medical residencies—this gives us the possibility of producing thousands of new employees who can go into the field and work in this area. We are ready for any questions you might have.

Chair Marzola:

I am all about keeping our students here. With that, Committee members, are there any questions?

Assemblymember Kasama:

Any time we can get more health care providers here, we need them in any discipline. Could you just clarify where the initial funding will come from for this and where you see the continued stream of funding will come from?

Senator Nguyen:

Currently, the way this is funded is in-part by the provider tax, like the hospital provider tax. That provider tax money is limited in scope for the types of programming it could do. Right now, as this is currently drafted, it does not include private insurance mandates. It is mostly just the Medicaid potential avenue. We would be able to utilize those Medicaid costs with that provider fee.

It will obviously take some time to develop that license process and where we are able to get those students in. Ideally, honestly, we talked about this—Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno knows we had these conversations when we saw what they were doing in Oregon. They still do not have a way to license these students who are going to graduate next year. They are going to graduate next year and they will not have the possibility to have these jobs. If we are able to move on this quickly and pass S.B. 165 (R2) and get these regulations in this new licensing process in place, we could conceivably take all of their graduates while

we are growing our own graduates. I teased Oregon by saying, I am glad you are training these people because we are going to be able to bring them over to our state because we are going to have a job for them. That is what we look forward to.

In addition, we were able to use quite a bit of opioid funds. There is such a correlation between mental health, children's mental health in particular, and the opioid epidemic. We have been able to qualify and utilize those funds to get this program started in this area. Unfortunately, we have done little to nothing of significance in the area of children's mental and behavioral health and I think this puts us in the right step.

Ideally, I would like to be in a situation where this is so successful that NSHE winds up taking it on. They would be able to realize that creating this degree program throughout various educational institutions of higher learning will be successful and students will want to be in this degree program.

Chair Marzola:

Any additional questions? [There were none.] We will start with support testimony on S.B. 165 (R2). Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in support?

Patricia Charlton, Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education:

We appreciate the sponsor for this bill and for the dedication and commitment to mental health for our community and our children. The Nevada System of Higher Education stands in support of this bill.

**Leonardo Benavides, Director, State Government Affairs and Community Engagement,
Office of Government and Community Engagement, University of Nevada,
Las Vegas:**

I am here on behalf of UNLV and also talking on behalf of Dr. Michelle Paul with the UNLV Partnership for Research, Assessment, Counseling, Therapy and Innovative Clinical Education (PRACTICE) program, here in support of S.B. 165 (R2). I will not belabor the statistics we have in mental health shortages in Nevada, but just a little bit about UNLV PRACTICE and their work.

The UNLV PRACTICE is ready to act now because the Interim Finance Committee, back in August 2024, approved funding for the Fund for a Resilient Nevada to support UNLV in launching a new doctoral program, the specialization in child psychology. The PRACTICE is home to a fully operational teaching, training, and research clinic that already serves as a critical hub for integrated professional behavioral health training. The clinic has the documented infrastructure, faculty, expertise, and clinical program needed to launch this high-quality, accredited internship program quickly and responsibly. With this funding, the PRACTICE will be ready to finalize the program, infrastructure, pursue full accreditation, and recruit the first cohort during the 2025-2026 match cycle to launch the program in July of 2026.

As the first accredited child psychology internship in Nevada, the internship will help retain talent in Nevada, strengthen our behavioral health pipeline, expand to specialty service for youth and families, and reduce long term workforce gaps with an immediate scalable solution. This is not a conceptual initiative; it is a shovel-ready solution. The UNLV PRACTICE stands prepared to launch, recruit, and train the next generation of psychologists who Nevada needs the most.

This legislative investment now will help ensure the first cohort is in place and serving Nevada families by July 2026. Finally, I would like to thank Senator Nguyen and Councilman Brian Knudson for their leadership on this project, as well as Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno and Senator Lange on that trip. It has been a pleasure working along our colleagues at UNR, Great Basin, and NSHE.

Sheila Bray, Director of Government and Community Engagement, University of Nevada, Reno:

We, too, are in full support and we will echo UNLV's comments in terms of just thanks to everybody for their help in working on this and thanks to Senator Nguyen and Dr. Tara Raines for bringing us in at the very beginning. We really think this is an innovative idea to spread out among the NSHE institutions on where we can really help this pipeline most. So, thank you, we are in support.

Dan Musgrove, Senior Vice President, Clark County Children's Mental Health Consortium:

I had the honor of joining Dr. Raines and a number of the folks that worked on this; attending a few meetings and super supportive. This is such an important thing to have folks come to our state or keep them in our state who can work for our kids and families. I am very supportive.

Annette Magnus-Marquart, representing MomsRising Together:

We are here in support of the bill and would urge your support.

Bradley Mayer, representing Raise the Future:

Raise the Future is an adoption nonprofit that works with the hardest to place foster youth by partnering with state and local governments. Many of our kids have mental and behavioral challenges. This is a great workforce bill to help create a pipeline of professionals who can especially focus on a prevention-oriented workforce as well to help our kids. Ditto what everybody else said and I really appreciate your time.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line to testify in support of Senate Bill 165 (2nd Reprint)? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line in opposition? [There was no one.] We will move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas? You may begin when you are ready.

Linda Buckardt, Nevadans CAN, Henderson, Nevada:

I have more questions about this. I think we never needed mental health before COVID. Is this necessary? Is it to just create jobs? Should we change the Common Core Curriculum, which is teaching our children how to think and feel? Behavioral health is taught and it mentions opioid addiction. As a master teacher, we had a program that taught kids the effects of drug use. It was called the DARE [Drug Abuse Resistance Education] program. However, we found more kids started to use it. Those are just my comments.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Las Vegas wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] Senator, would you like to give any closing remarks? [Closing remarks were waived.] I will now close the hearing on S.B. 165 (R2). I am going to take the bills slightly out of order. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 389 (2nd Reprint), which revises provisions relating to the administration of pharmacy benefits under Medicaid and certain other health plans. Welcome, Senator, you may begin when you are ready.

Senate Bill 389 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the administration of pharmacy benefits under Medicaid and certain other health plans. (BDR 38-240)

Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9:

I will tell you a little bit about Senate Bill 389 (2nd Reprint). Essentially, what S.B. 389 (R2) does is it moves our Nevada Medicaid from the multiple pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs) they currently utilize to a single PBM. It is a highly technical bill. It has been amended numerous times to get it to this place. I hope you will allow me to phone a friend when it comes time to answer questions for you. This has also already been through both a policy committee and a money committee on the other side.

While there are initial start-up costs to implement the bill and move us from the multiple PBMs we currently use to a single PBM going forward, ultimately, this is a cost-saving measure, even though this not a money committee, which is part of the policy. Part of the policy is to save the state money by bringing us on to a single PBM and reducing drug prices for everybody throughout the system.

When Medicaid moves to a single PBM, they will be able to more effectively negotiate with drug manufacturers and streamline the pricing process for pharmacists who dispense these medications. Right now, a pharmacist who works at your local CVS, Smith's, or a family pharmacist might have 100 patients on Medicaid who each have one of the five different PBMs. Even though they are dispensing the same medication to those 100 patients, they have to bill them differently for each one because they have been negotiated to a different price. This would allow us to charge everybody the same price for the same drug. I would be happy to phone my friend to answer any questions if that is okay.

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, are there any questions?

Assemblymember Hardy:

Having worked a little bit on prescription drug policy before, it is very complicated with the PBMs and all that. I think this is a good idea. Is this PBM already existing or are you just going to move them all to the one? Is it something that has to be developed, and that is why the date is 2030?

Keiko Duncan, PharmD, Medicaid Pharmacy Director, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services:

It does not currently exist. We would have to go through the state's procurement process. The bill itself details specifics and transparency pieces the contract would have to include that PBMs would need to bid on.

Chair Marzola:

Any additional questions? [There were none.] We will start with support testimony of S.B. 389 (R2). Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in support? You may go when you are ready.

Keibi Mejia, representing Nevada Society for Dermatology and Dermatologic Surgery:

We would like to thank the sponsor and urge your support.

Dan Musgrove, representing Prime Therapeutics:

We actually are serving right now as the state's pharmacy benefit administrator (PBA) for the fee-for-service Medicaid population. We like to call ourselves a PBA because our true role is to be the administrator of this program for the state. Our job is not to share in the profits of rebates or pricing. Our job is to get that and share it with the state so the state makes the money on this and can put it back into the program to help all our constituents. This is something that has been happening in states around us and we strictly focus on helping states in this regard and are supportive of this going forward.

Liz MacMenamin, Vice President of Government Affairs, Retail Association of Nevada:

I am here in strong support of Senator Scheible's bill and appreciate her doing the work on bringing this forward. The PBMs are a real problem in our state and in the nation, and I think that reform is—we are very slow to get to the table to enact some of this reform, but I appreciate this session really concentrating on seeing what is best for the patients in Nevada.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line for support testimony? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition to S.B. 389 (R2). Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line for opposition testimony? [There was no one.] We will move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line for neutral testimony? [There was no one.] Are there any closing remarks? [Closing remarks were waived.] I will close the hearing on S.B. 389 (R2).

I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint). This measure makes revisions relating to reproductive health care. Welcome, Senator Cannizzaro, you may begin when you are ready.

**Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint): Makes revisions relating to reproductive health care.
(BDR 40-24)**

Senator Nicole Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6:

I am extremely proud to bring to you today Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint). I am joined, Madam Chair, in Las Vegas by Amanda Klein, whom I would like to turn the presentation over to once I have been able to make a few remarks and walk you all through the various portions of S.B. 217 (R2).

This particular bill revises certain provisions relating to reproductive health care and really relates to how it is we are giving opportunities to so many Nevadans to experience parenthood. Parenthood is a deeply meaningful and life-changing experience for many individuals and couples. The ability to bring a family into this world and to build one is not only a personal milestone but also a fundamental aspect of human connection, providing love, stability, and a sense of purpose for so many. However, for millions of people and so many Nevadans, they are facing infertility or other barriers to conception, and that dream of parenthood can feel out of reach.

In the United States, infertility affects a significant portion of the population. Nearly ten million women aged 15 to 45 experience impaired fecundity, indicating difficulties in getting pregnant or carrying a pregnancy to term. Among married women aged 15 to 49 years, 8.5 percent, or approximately 2.4 million, are infertile, meaning they have been unable to conceive after at least 12 consecutive months of unprotected sexual intercourse. About 9 percent of men and 11 percent of women of reproductive age have experienced fertility problems.

Advancements in reproductive medicine, including in vitro fertilization (IVF) and other forms of assisted reproductive technology (ART), have transformed the way individuals and couples achieve this dream. These treatments provide hope and opportunity for those struggling with infertility, same-sex couples seeking biological parenthood, individuals with medical conditions that affect fertility, and those who choose to conceive later in life.

Although often successful, these treatments can also be very costly and often serve as the biggest barrier to fertility preservation. Insurance coverage for these services varies depending on the insurance plan, state, and other individual circumstances. For example, California, Massachusetts, and New York have enacted legislation requiring certain health insurance plans to cover IVF. In other cases, some health insurance plans may cover a specific number of assisted reproductive cycles or have a maximum amount they will cover. Without coverage for these treatments, however, many survivors may not have the opportunity to become parents of a biological child.

For a brief walkthrough of the bill, we will begin with sections 2 through 6, which define certain terms relating to assisted reproduction. Section 7 provides the provisions of this bill apply to all state and local laws and ordinances regardless of when they were enacted. Section 7 also prohibits government entities from restricting access to assisted reproduction, health care providers ability to offer related services, insurance coverage, or individuals' control over their own reproductive genetic material.

Section 8 strengthens these protections by prohibiting governmental limitations that specifically target and substantially burden assisted reproduction related to drugs, devices, or health care providers offering these services. Section 8 also grants individuals, health care providers, and insurers the right to challenge such burdens in court and additionally authorizes the Attorney General's Office to intervene against unlawful restrictions on assisted reproduction.

Section 9 provides important legal protections for individuals and entities involved in assisted reproduction. Following the Alabama Supreme Court's February 2024 ruling, the liability concerns for clinics were far-reaching, and in the absence of the Alabama Legislature's swift action, could have severely limited the ability of clinics in Alabama to continue providing service to their patients. Therefore, section 9 ensures no person or organization can face civil or criminal liability, disciplinary actions, or administrative sanctions solely for providing or receiving goods or services related to assisted reproduction.

This protection also extends to those storing or transporting embryos and manufacturers of reproductive-related goods, shielding them from liability in cases of embryo damage or loss. However, it is important to note these protections do not apply in cases of negligence, criminal activity, or actions that fall outside the provider's scope of practice, training, or expertise.

Section 10 provides a fertilized egg or human embryo that exists before implantation in the uterus of a human body is not considered a human being for any purpose under Nevada law. Sections 12, 13, 15, 20, 24, 27 through 29, 32, 36, 38, 42, and 45 require certain health insurers, including some private employers who provide insurance to their employees, to provide a special enrollment period to a person determined by a qualified health provider to be pregnant. During this period, the pregnant person must be allowed to enroll in a health care plan outside the period of open enrollment.

Sections 12 through 14, 23, 31, 37, 38, and 44 require certain health care plans to provide coverage. Sections 12 through 14, 19, 23, 31, 37, 38, and 44 prohibit an insurer from imposing conditions, including cost sharing, prior authorizations, and waiting periods on fertility treatment or fertility preservation if such conditions are not required for similar benefits that are not related to fertility.

Section 16 exempts small employers' association health plans and employers who provide benefits for health care for their employees through a self-insured plan from these requirements. Section 41 authorizes the Commissioner of Insurance to suspend or revoke the

certificate of a health maintenance organization that fails to provide the coverage required by section 37. The Commissioner is also authorized to take such action against other health insurers who fail to provide the coverage required by sections 23 and 44. With that, Madam Chair, I would like to turn the presentation over to Amanda Klein in Las Vegas, who will provide some additional information and has been working on this issue for a very long time. She will be able to provide some helpful information to the members of the Committee.

Amanda Klein, Founder and President, Nevada Fertility Advocates:

Three miscarriages, two medically necessary abortions, multiple tests, hundreds of needles, two rounds of IVF, five doctors, one surrogate, and six figures. This is what it took to bring our beautiful daughter into the world. Would I do it again? Absolutely, in a heartbeat, without a second thought. However, there are so many ways this journey could and should have been easier for people like me and my husband.

One in six Nevadans struggles with the disease of infertility. The American Medical Association has recognized infertility as a disease for decades, just like cancer, diabetes, or heart disease. Eighty-five percent of Americans are supportive of IVF, and yet there is still a stigma that remains. The result: we do not talk about our infertility journeys. It is too raw, too personal, and too painful, but we need to speak up.

We need employers to understand how hard it is to go back to work the day after having a miscarriage. We need our families and friends to be aware of what we are going through and be sensitive to our plight. Most importantly, we need our lawmakers to understand how big of an issue this truly is and to act on our behalf. I support, with all my heart, S.B. 217 (R2).

Fertility treatment needs to be affordable. It needs to be accessible. Infertility needs to be treated like any other disease and recognized by insurance companies as a covered benefit. Employers need to offer fertility benefits to appropriately care for their workforce. This is good for our economy and the overall health of our communities. In vitro fertilization must be protected and not politicized or vilified. Doctors should be able to care for their patients without fear of retribution. Intended parents should be able to grow their family in the way they see fit without going into significant debt.

My husband and I have successful careers, but even with two good salaries, we could not afford IVF and surrogacy on our own. My father had to sell his house and give us all the proceeds from the sale. My in-laws had to dip into their life savings. Every dollar we made went to paying them back. We are very fortunate to have a support system with these kinds of resources, but most people cannot build their families this way.

Contrary to popular belief, infertility is not just a women's issue; it affects men just as much. There is female factor infertility, male factor infertility, and many situations where both male and female factors are at play. We spend our entire adult lives trying not to get pregnant; when we are finally ready to start a family and find out we cannot, that reality is hard to grasp.

If you cannot conceive naturally or are having a hard time getting pregnant, it is not your fault. There is nothing wrong with you. You are not damaged, and you are not broken. Trust me. This is the narrative in every person's head when going through this journey. Limiting access to IVF and other treatment modalities strips couples and single people who want to be parents of having a child that is genetically theirs. I have heard it all throughout the years. Why do you not just adopt? Why do you not foster? Do you really need to be a parent to have a happy life? These questions, while well intended, are like a dagger to the heart for someone going through infertility. None of these family-building paths are easy. Society is essentially saying that unless you are wealthy, you do not deserve a child that is genetically yours; that is wrong.

In 2020, I founded Nevada Fertility Advocates. We are a volunteer-based organization that supports the one in six Nevadans who struggle with the disease of infertility. We do this through community awareness, employer education, and advocacy. I am honored to work with the Senator as she fights for women and families and ask that all members of the Assembly join us in this fight.

This bill is about fighting for families and access to high-quality, affordable health care. Family building should not be a partisan issue. Currently, 22 other states have some form of infertility coverage. Nevada should be next. I honestly do not know what I would do without my daughter. She is the light of my life and the reason I fight. All I want for her is a better tomorrow.

Senator Cannizzaro:

I am extremely grateful to Ms. Klein for being so willing to come in and give testimony and share her experience. These sorts of things are so incredibly difficult, and I think all too often we do not talk about how incredibly impactful these decisions can be and some of the obstacles that exist along the way.

We assume this is not an issue, but it is something people face on a regular basis, and so many Nevadans do. Without some kind of resources to be able to not only provide the right protections in law to ensure access to IVF and to ART but then to also provide some ability for folks to access that, we are really shutting the door and turning a blind eye to this issue, that truly is painful and very tough. If we can provide a little bit of hope to families who are struggling, then I think it is worth it. The whole purpose of S.B. 217 (R2) is to provide the right protections and ensure access. With that, Madam Chair and members of the Committee, I would be happy to take any questions you or the members of the Committee may have.

Chair Marzola:

Thank you for your presentation, Senator, and thank you so much, Ms. Klein, for being here with us today and talking to us about your experience. I know it is tough. Committee members, are there any questions? [There were none.] We will start with support testimony of S.B. 217 (R2) in Carson City. You may begin when you are ready.

Jacqueline L. Nguyen, Policy Director, Nevada State Medical Association:

I am also a very proud mom of three children whom we are blessed to have after a seven-year IVF journey. We are in strong support of S.B. 217 (R2). In vitro fertilization provides a critical medical solution for individuals and couples facing infertility. And IVF often includes advanced testing which can help identify serious genetic conditions before pregnancy. This earlier identification can lower maternal and neonatal health risks. Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint) also improves health care access by increasing insurance coverage for infertility treatments and preservation, an essential step toward equity in reproductive care. We are very thankful and in full support of this bill and thank the Senator for bringing this forth.

Sara Adler, representing American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Nevada Section:

As you have heard, S.B. 217 (R2) creates a comprehensive policy inclusive of important definitions and protections needed for obstetrician/gynecologists and other providers, especially post the Alabama ruling.

Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint) can bring the joy of parenthood that is desperately wanted by many more Nevada families, not only those who have high incomes or families who can afford to assist them. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists requests your support for this measure in the strongest terms possible and thanks to the sponsor for her continuous championship of reproductive care and rights in our state.

Annie Vong, representing Leukemia Lymphoma Society; and Nevada Public Health Association:

Both groups support this bill.

Yoana Ontiveros, representing Henderson Chamber of Commerce:

The Henderson Chamber would like to express our support for S.B. 217 (R2). We thank Senator Cannizzaro for her leadership and collaboration in working with us to craft an amendment that addresses the needs of Nevada's small businesses regarding association health plans. We appreciate the opportunity to provide this testimony and urge your support on this bill. On a personal side note, my doctor told me the only way I would probably be able to get pregnant one day is through IVF. This does not just affect a certain class of women; it affects everyone. We urge your support.

Mo Denis, representing Americans for Contraception:

We are in support of this bill and urge support. I am grateful to the Senator for bringing this forth. On a personal note, I have the most amazing grandson who was conceived through IVF and I know the struggles my daughter and my son-in-law went through. It was a challenge financially for them, but after, I think it took them about ten years, and that is a long time, but he is the most amazing grandson. We are grateful for this medical procedure that can help families and I urge your support.

Jennifer Lopez, Private Citizen, Clark County, Nevada:

I am here today in my personal capacity to express strong support for S.B. 217 (R2). Infertility is one of the most isolating and heartbreaking experiences I have ever felt. It felt like living under a cloud, one that never lifted; each month brought more disappointment, more tears, and more questions about whether I would ever experience the joys of motherhood. On top of the emotional toll, there was a devastating financial one. My husband and I live paycheck to paycheck, pull from modest savings accounts, and pay out-of-pocket every step of the way. Appointments, tests, and medications. One round of IVF costs \$20,000. In total, we spent \$25,000 just to conceive our son.

Our insurance covered none of it—not the medications, not the blood work, and not even the doctor visits. That kind of sacrifice just is not possible for families and yet, through the grace of God and the miracle of science, we conceived. That was the moment the sun came out, and years of praying and scraping together money, that positive test was more than a medical result; it was hope made real.

Today, I know the joy of motherhood. We are proud parents to RJ Gourrier-Lopez, a rising sixth grader, straight-A student, black belt in Taekwondo, and the current UNLV Clark County Strong Start Youth Mayor. Per the youth mayor, he would want me to add that he really enjoys art and soccer.

Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint) would ease the burden for others who just want a chance to build a family. It represents equity, dignity, and the fundamental right to pursue parenthood. It also ensures cancer patients can protect their fertility and medical decisions stay where they belong, between a doctor and patient. Nevada has a chance to lead with compassion and fairness. Do not let the cost be the barrier that keeps someone from experiencing the joys of parenthood.

Chair Marzola:

Mrs. Lopez, if you can finish up.

Jennifer Lopez:

Please support S.B. 217 (R2).

Maddison Proctor, representing Nevada Women's Lobby:

We are just dittoing everything.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] I do see you seated in Las Vegas. You may begin when you are ready.

Leah Kaye, MD, Fertility Center of Las Vegas:

I am a reproductive endocrinologist and infertility specialist at the Fertility Center of Las Vegas. I represent two other doctors who work with me, and I am one clinic among the six in the state of Nevada that provide infertility care.

You will hear, and have heard, very moving stories of how this treatment, which is safe and highly effective in helping families in Nevada. I will give you some numbers instead. Approximately 70,000 women of reproductive age in the state of Nevada will be affected by infertility. Plus, 12 percent of men will be. There are countless servicemen and servicewomen who choose to give the best part of their reproductive lives to help our families and then they have so much trouble building their own when they come back.

There is an entire community of LGBTQ people who require these medical treatments to grow their families and all of them are being excluded. Many of the patients I see have insurance coverage, but their insurance is discriminating against their diagnosis, and I believe that is unfair.

In 2024, we saw about 1,000 new patient consults, and probably only half of them even showed back up to do diagnostic testing, which means the other half have infertility based on their history but do not even pursue testing to figure out what is going on and to therefore provide treatments. It is shameful. These are hardworking Nevadans; these are people who just want to grow their families, and they see everybody around them doing it. This is something that affects one in six couples. It is something that affects somebody who everybody in this room knows, and it is shameful we cannot provide this service.

What I see on my end is patients come, find out they need IVF, and they go to other states or other countries to seek suboptimal care when we have some of the best IVF providers here in the state of Nevada. They come back to us \$100,000 in debt and again at the beginning of the journey because it did not work when they went to Mexico or wherever else. The other thing I see is they—

Chair Marzola:

I am sorry, if you can, please wrap up your testimony. Your time has ended.

Leah Kaye:

Absolutely. I urge your support for S.B. 217 (R2).

Elizabeth Lopez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am here today in my personal capacity and as a woman who has walked the deep personal, emotional, and often invisible journey of infertility. I truly believed I was doing everything right, pursuing my dreams, building a meaningful career in public service, working to uplift our communities, becoming the first in my family to graduate from college, and even going back for my MBA.

I was waiting for the right partner, and the right time. I was trying to build a strong foundation before starting a family, but time does not wait and infertility does not care how prepared you are or how hard you worked. Like so many others in Nevada in a similar situation, I always dreamed of becoming a mother and having a family one day. I decided to try and do it on my own. What I did not expect was how hard, expensive, and emotionally

draining this path would be. I have experienced the heartbreak of failed cycles, miscarriage, the isolation of not being able to talk about it openly until today, and the overwhelming cost that puts this dream out of reach.

The financial strain is real; the emotional toll is even greater. There were days I showed up to work with a brave face even though I was grieving and had failed another attempt. Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint) would give families a fighting chance. It would provide the insurance coverage that recognizes infertility as a legitimate medical condition and provide opportunities for others who want to become a single parent by choice or with a particular partner. This bill gives hope, it gives fairness and, most importantly, it gives access to people who may otherwise be priced out of their dream to have a family. I urge you to please vote yes on S.B. 217 (R2). Let Nevada lead with compassion, equity, and family-first values.

Jennifer Atlas, Government Relations Director, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network:

We are in strong support of S.B. 217 (R2) and urge your support to ensure Nevadans facing cancer have access to the full spectrum of care, including the ability to make decisions about their reproductive future. We thank Senator Cannizzaro for bringing this bill and continuing to be a champion for Nevada's families. [Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit Q](#).]

Linda Buckardt, Nevadans CAN, Henderson, Nevada:

I would like to support this bill. I have many friends who have gone through infertility issues, and I really can relate to these women who have had problems. I fortunately did not have a problem. When you abort, it is a death. It is a death that a person is not alive inside of you.

I am glad to hear you are pro-life, and I urge that we change our way of funding this. We taxpayers pay for abortions even to those who are from other states. We could tunnel those funds or change those funds to a different—

Chair Marzola:

Ma'am, are you supporting the bill? Because if you support the bill—

Linda Buckardt:

I am in support, ma'am.

Chair Marzola:

Then you have to support it in its entirety.

Linda Buckardt:

Okay, I would like to see you fund this.

Samantha Barnes, representing Comprehensive Cancer Centers of Nevada:

We want to thank the Senator for bringing this important piece of legislation forward, and we are here today in full support. On a personal note, as a proud mom of a little eight-month-old girl I did suffer a miscarriage the first time. I fully support this bill.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line?

Jenny Stepp, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

[Read from [Exhibit R](#).] I am a licensed clinical professional counselor in private practice in Las Vegas. I specialize in trauma and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), mood, and anxiety disorders. I also serve as the Healthcare Action Team Chair for the Nevada Chapter of the National Organization for Women.

I am calling today with my enthusiastic support of S.B. 217 (R2) because I see firsthand the devastating physical, emotional, psychological, and relational impact of infertility on my clients and health care providers in our community. Infertility is a recognized medical condition that has substantial consequences for people facing this condition.

Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint) would go a long way to support individuals, families, and health care providers facing this challenging problem by expanding access to services and treatments. Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint) promotes health equity, especially for those undergoing cancer treatment, LGBTQ+ families, and lower-income individuals who often face coverage gaps.

Secondly, this bill establishes clear legal protections for individuals seeking assisted reproduction services and ensures reproductive freedom is legally safeguarded in Nevada, which is something Nevadans have unequivocally voted to support in recent elections.

Lastly, this bill fosters a more supportive and secure environment for health care providers, clinics, labs, and biotech companies involved in reproductive care, which encourages participation in an expansion of fertility services and promotes innovation and service delivery by reducing legal ambiguity. All of these issues would support growth and expansion in Nevada's health care industry, which is something Governor Lombardo has prioritized in his executive agenda. For these reasons, I urge you to vote yes on S.B. 217 (R2).

Bri Schmidt, Program Associate, Silver State Equality:

All Nevadans deserve access to health care, both for themselves and their families. Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint), protections of assisted reproduction, help protect all Nevadans. We support S.B. 217 (R2) and urge you to support this as well, and we ditto the other callers.

Kendahl Servino, Board Member, Nevada Fertility Advocates:

I speak as a board member on behalf of the Nevada Fertility Advocates and as a pediatric physician here to tell my story today.

Prior to chemotherapy, I was asked whether I wanted to be a mother one day. Having just received a life-altering diagnosis of cancer one week prior, my potential for motherhood had not been on my mind. The more pressing acute matters of attending to hair loss, whether I

need time off from college and, of course, whether I would even live. I was 20 years old at the time. So much of one's life course is altered immediately after the words you have cancer, and for me this included my decision to spend my career advocating for children as a pediatric physician.

Chemotherapy alone, with a plethora of side effects, is often overlooked. An unaware side effect is latrogenic infertility or infertility caused by chemotherapy, radiation therapy, or any other toxic treatments that may render someone medically infertile. For myself this placed a huge burden both financially and emotionally on my family on top of an already devastating diagnosis.

In most states, these services are considered elective and not covered by insurance. This caused undue stress during a time when I was already going through chemotherapy and medical school applications at the time after the [COVID-19] pandemic. For cancer patients, sometimes all we want is to retain as much normalcy as we can to have a sense of a healthy, promising future. For those of us who want it, our future should include the possibility of having a future family. Cancer already takes so much away from us. It does not need to take this away from us too. I am honored and excited to work with Senator Cannizzaro again as we persevere in this fight and take this journey in the legislative session. I strongly support S.B. 217 (R2) and urge everyone else to do the same.

Jennifer Peterson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

My husband and I were both faced with infertility problems and had to do IVF in order to grow our family. We are both self-employed and insurance did not cover the testing and treatment we needed. The high cost of fertility treatments added to the stress and difficulty we faced. We are one of the couples who had to leave the country to be able to afford IVF.

I have PTSD from my experience and went through bouts of depression and increased anxiety as a result of the seven IVFs I endured. Treatment and our many losses affected my ability to work. I ended up quitting my 17-year career to go back to school to become a therapist for people going through infertility. I can attest to the fact every single person I see laments the high cost of testing and treatment. An infertility diagnosis and year of treatment cause the same amount of trauma as a breast cancer diagnosis and a year of treatment.

The use of assisted reproductive technologies is increasing at a rate of 5 to 10 percent per year. This is a disease that is not going away, and having a family should not be reserved only for the people who can afford to pay tens to hundreds of thousands of dollars just for the chance to have a baby. Learning you are facing infertility is traumatic and filled with grief. Please support Nevadans who desperately want to become parents and support S.B. 217 (R2).

Cyndy Flores, Private Citizen:

I am enjoying today with my almost 10-week-old daughter, Violet, who is my miracle IVF baby. I probably will cry through this. Over the last three years we have spent tens of thousands of dollars to bring sweet Violet into the world. But more than the money, it was

the heartbreak and the difficulties of going through infertility. Infertility takes the joy out of trying to grow your family but also takes the joy out of your life. Violet has brought that joy back.

I am calling in support of this bill, not just for the financial aspects but also for the legal protections this bill brings forth. Last February when the Alabama ruling came down, I was at an IVF clinic waiting for my appointment for an ultrasound to see how many eggs were growing; one of them became baby Violet. To be in the clinic and be like, What does this mean for the country? Eventually this will affect everybody, not just the women and the families in Alabama.

To see this bill address some of these issues that, hopefully, one day will not be an issue, but to know that in Nevada our rights as parents and as women going through infertility treatments and going through IVF are protected; our embryos and our future potential children are protected; the brave doctors and the incredible doctors and health care professionals who provide IVF treatment are also going to be protected from people with a political agenda to take away this really important medical procedure or medical process to bring joy back into our lives.

Chair Marzola:

If you could please wrap up your testimony.

Cyndy Flores:

Yes, sorry. So please vote yes in support of this bill because it does affect so many Nevada families.

Chair Marzola:

That is the last caller we will be taking due to time. Anyone who is still sitting on the phone for support testimony, if you can please submit your testimony in writing, we will make sure the entire Committee gets it. With that, we will move to testimony in opposition of S.B. 217 (R2). Is there anyone in Carson City?

Melissa Clement, Executive Director, Nevada Right to Life:

I am testifying in opposition to S.B. 217 (R2). Nevada Right to Life is opposed to the bill as written, not necessarily the underlying concept. Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint) will embed a nonscientific definition into Nevada law.

This bill treats human embryos as medical products or property not as living human beings, denying both the basic biological facts supported by modern embryology, medicine, and science and the very real belief of the parents of these embryos who desperately want children. Please take a look at section 10 of the bill. It is nonscientific and it is ideological.

The Senator mentioned an Alabama case. In 2024, the Alabama Supreme Court ruled frozen embryos were legally considered children under the state's wrongful death of a minor act. The case arose after several couples sued a fertility clinic for the accidental destruction of their embryos arguing wrongful death. The court rightly sided with the parents in recognizing the profound loss of their family members, not just property.

By treating embryos as nonpersons, S.B. 217 (R2) undermines parental rights, denies legal recognition to the unborn, and reduces human life to disposable material immune from civil accountability. Families deserve the right to grieve, to seek justice, and to protect their unborn children, not a system that prioritizes medical institutions over moral responsibility. Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint) serves primarily to shield fertility clinics and doctors from civil liability, not to serve or safeguard families, especially mothers. It entrenches illegal immunity for providers even when embryos—children—are mishandled or destroyed. Please vote no on S.B. 217 (R2).

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:

I am a mother, and I have 18 grandchildren, and I feel so blessed. But my heart breaks for those who want children and have not been able to. It is always a question I have in my mind of why it is that way.

I do have a couple of concerns about this bill. One of them is that it redefines life. We all know life begins at conception; we have that scientifically proven these days, but we do not know the long-term consequences of changing that definition in this bill, and that concerns me.

Another concern I have is the huge cost. I know this is not a fiscal committee, but this will have real-life impacts. The cost to insurance companies will raise all of our rates. Right now, many people cannot afford insurance as it is and they are struggling to put food on the table. These will be real-life consequences they will have to deal with because this is not a minor addition to an insurance policy. It is a huge cost as well as a huge cost to our state Medicaid. I appreciate the heartbreak of the people who have been here today, and my heart goes out to them, but we do have these concerns we want to share with you.

Cliff Nellis, Evangelist/Shepherd, Freedom Evangelism:

I did not intend to come down here for this, but I saw this, and I thought, Wow. I am an advocate for all of the families of this area and of this state who are going to get whacked over the head with a 20 percent increase—that is my estimate—in their insurance rates.

In 2003, I sought to change my career so I got an insurance selling license. I sold mainly health insurance, but just on the side of my regular business. I could write a policy for a family and an HSA [Health Savings Account] with a \$5,000 deductible and pay 100 percent after the \$5,000—which is much better than the Bronze Plan of Obamacare now—for \$300 a month.

What are people paying now, families? Like \$1,700 to \$1,800 a month. I am not even sure. It is outrageous because of requirements on the insurance companies. This is going to be a requirement that they pay for this. Have you guys seen how many auto body shops there are in Sparks? If insurance did not cover auto body repair, how many shops would there be? Instead of hundreds, there would be about ten. When you mandate insurance coverage, everyone else has to pay for your procedure, and this is not a disease.

Now, I am for people having children; as a matter of fact, I think maybe an easier and cheaper solution would be to ban the use of contraception.

Chair Marzola:

Sir, can you please wrap up your testimony? Your time is up.

Cliff Nellis:

Ok. That is just my opinion. Please consider the consequences of voting for something like this because there are a lot of hidden traps.

Joshua Skaggs, Legislative Affairs Director, Nevada Republican Party:

We are here today in opposition to S.B. 217 (R2). We ditto the concerns expressed by Nevada Right to Life. A serious concern we have with this bill is the significant fiscal note attached to it.

The Executive Branch submitted a \$38 million fiscal note primarily due to the need to provide coverage for IVF services to Medicaid beneficiaries. The federal government agreed to temporarily subsidize the Medicaid expansion during COVID-19 from 100 percent of the federal poverty level to 138 percent. There is concern this temporary subsidy may be coming to an end which will have a serious effect on the state's budget if we elect to continue the expansion. Adding another significant expense to Medicaid could be an issue for budgeting.

I was also interested to read in the note that the \$38 million is an estimate because no other state offers IVF services to their beneficiaries. The fiscal note is based on an estimate of 5 percent utilization. However, because Nevada has no data from other states to rely on, the estimates could be significantly off. We do not believe in the current environment it makes sense for Nevada to add a potentially expensive benefit to Medicaid not offered by other states and we urge caution on this bill.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line?

Teresa DeGraffenreid, Private Citizen, Douglas County, Nevada:

I am a resident of Douglas County here today in opposition to S.B. 217 (R2) on my own behalf. I echo the concerns expressed by Nevada Right to Life.

I also have serious concerns with section 10, which states a fertilized egg or human embryo that exists before implantation in the uterus of a human body is not a human being for any purpose under Nevada law. This is a bill that claims to support human life and IVF to build families. It seems inappropriate to say embryos are not human life when they most definitely are. It makes me wonder if this was an attempt to embed this horrible language in a bill.

I also object to the use of the term pregnant person in the bill, as only women can become pregnant. Another attempt to embed horrible language and untrue information about IVF and women's health care.

I am also concerned about this being a mandate for Medicaid and private insurers. This will bankrupt the Medicaid system and cause private health insurance companies to leave the state and small businesses to no longer offer insurance to their employees. I could be in support of this bill on the merits of protecting women and families needing IVF if these concerns were addressed by amendments.

My final thought about this bill comes from Dr. Seuss in *Horton Hears a Who*: "A person's a person, no matter how small."

Katrin Ivanoff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I want to say my heart goes out to the people who are going through infertility problems. I personally went through that for several years. I could not afford the IVF, and God blessed me with two kids. Regardless, I did try to go the IVF route. I feel for them.

I like the intent of the bill, but I really do not like how the bill is trying to rewrite what life is, trying to rewrite what pregnancy is, and pregnant person. It is a slap in the face of every person who has ever been pregnant. Every woman who has ever been pregnant because no man has ever been pregnant. There is no need to put person where we all know it should be the word woman.

I wish this bill were rewritten, and it gives, of course, to families who want to have kids but not leave a bunch of embryos lying around, not knowing what they are going to do with them or what anybody would do with the embryos that are left.

My heart goes out to people who go through that. I personally went through it. The bill, as written, please vote no.

Cristiane Mersch, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I echo everything Nevada Right to Life said in the statement. We oppose this bill. We are concerned about the term that it is not recognizing humans and not people; it is just property. Senate Bill 217 (1st Reprint) strips legal recognition of that term. Let us be clear; this is dehumanizing. It means if a clinic destroys your embryo, Nevada treats it like lost property and not the death of your unborn child.

Even worse, it gives a blanket immunity to IVF providers to not have accountability and no justice, even in cases of gross negligence or malpractice. You have seen that in the past happening. Guess what? It is also bad because it mandates insurance coverage for IVF, which is a very expensive procedure. And again, like a lot of people said here, we feel bad for families who cannot have babies in a natural way, but that is not the solution.

Cynthia Perine, Private Citizen:

Yes, compassion is in order for families who have difficulty expanding their families through IVF, indeed. I think compassion is also in order for Nevada taxpayers who would have to put, indirectly or directly, a very expensive program here. I echo the thoughts of the others in opposition.

Yolanda Knaak, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada:

I agree with all the previous callers in opposition. Having a family and paying for insurance is going to become unaffordable under this bill. I am not opposed to IVF, I struggled myself with infertility, and I am opposed to this bill because of the things that have been mentioned and especially because the cost of family health insurance is going to be unaffordable. Please vote no.

Chair Marzola:

Our time has ended on the phone lines for opposition. Anyone still sitting on the phone lines in opposition to this bill, please submit it in writing and I will make sure the entire Committee gets it. We will move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral? You may begin when you are ready.

Adam Plain, Insurance Regulation Liaison, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry:

I do not have written testimony on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System, but I do have some from the Senate side that essentially still stands.

The Division wanted to make clear our understanding of the legislative intent is the provisions of section 8 do not prohibit the Division from actually enforcing the provisions of a contract of insurance and that would not be considered substantially burdening the access of a member to reproductive services.

Additionally, to the extent the legislative body is considering looking at a year-round open enrollment period for people who are expecting or are pregnant, the Division would note Senate Bill 425 of the 77th Session included a provision in section 33.5, subsection 2, which granted a year-round open enrollment period with 90-day wait periods for all plans off the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange. That was repealed in 2019 in section 56 of Senate Bill 482 of the 80th Session. If you are interested, I would encourage anyone to go look at the legislative history to figure out how that may or may not affect any decisions you make.

Finally, this bill does not trigger any federal defrayal provisions, and we have worked with the sponsor to tighten up some of the language around which groups it affects and whatnot, and we want to thank her for working with us on that. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Shelly Capurro, representing Nevada Association of Health Plans:

We are an 11-member organization that includes both commercial and public plans. While we appreciate the intent of the Senator's legislation, mandates do often come with unintended consequences that can drive up costs for consumers and reduce plan flexibility. These increased costs ultimately translate into higher premiums, deductibles, and out-of-pocket expenses for employers and individuals.

Additionally, mandates can limit consumer choice by requiring all policyholders pay for coverage they may not want or need, reducing flexibility and plan options. As an association, our members estimate a minimum increased cost of \$9 per member per month.

We remain committed to enhancing health care quality and accessibility and welcome the opportunity to collaborate on policy solutions that align with legislative goals while ensuring Nevadans have access to affordable, sustainable health care coverage.

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

The Vegas Chamber is in neutral on S.B. 217 (R2), and we appreciate the Senator's work with the Chamber and other chambers of commerce and trade associations regarding the association of the health care plan component of the bill. We appreciate her working with us, and we are neutral on the bill.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line?

Krystal Minera-Alvis, Private Citizen:

I do recognize the deep desire for many families to conceive and fully support ethical advancement. The question and concern I have is the ability to do that. I do see that S.B. 217 (R2) expands on that. The concerns I have is, does it consider the broader impact on health care affordability and insurance coverage by mandating IVF through insurance? Procedures may lead to increased premiums and reduced benefits for policyholders. While it is ensuring access to fertility treatments, which are valuable, it is going to expand coverage requirements, which are going to place financial strains on individuals, businesses, and insurers. Overall, it is going to affect health care sustainability. Policyholders who may never use ART could also see their costs rise, and it can make coverage less affordable for many, many families. I think there needs to be a true balance in accessibility with fairness and health care costs for essential long-term stability.

Chair Marzola:

Senator, would you like to give any closing remarks?

Senator Cannizzaro:

I just want to address a couple of things because we have heard some of these—just with respect to putting forward this bill on the Senate side, watching it move, and having some folks come and talk to us. I think Amanda Klein might still be in Las Vegas. I know the cost aspect of this has been a question and a concern. I do not know if she wants to join in or has anything to add. I see her coming up because I know she knows just a bit more about that.

With respect to the piece where there may have been some confusion on the Medicaid portion, the way we crafted this language is this does not become effective until later with the idea that Medicaid can apply for waivers in order to be able to help pay for the cost of this as it pertains to Medicaid coverage.

I think the other piece I just want to touch on very quickly, section 9, I would direct the Committee or anyone who has concerns about whether or not this opens up liability. What we have done in this bill is recognize any time you are engaged in IVF or ART, the chance of an embryo not making it to a born baby is always a risk. Embryos may not ultimately begin to develop, an egg might not be fertilized, or an embryo implanted in a uterus might not actually attach. There are just different things about the existence of those embryos before they are implanted in a uterus that can cause them to just not make it. In recognition of that, and in light of the Alabama Supreme Court's decision, which has effectively shut off access to IVF because of a declaration that embryos, in fact, had personhood, that puts providers at risk for potential liabilities if we are not clear about exactly what it is they can and cannot be liable for.

Section 9 does nothing to abrogate any liability that would be imposed on any providers of reproductive health care who are engaged in IVF or ART, if they are acting within the scope of their practice; if they are not negligent; if they are not committing a crime; or if there were not some other Nevada law that would impose those sorts of liabilities on them. This is clarity to allow for the fact that in the course of IVF or ART, there are instances where it just does not work, and when it just does not work, that is not a reason for a provider to face those types of liabilities.

The definition in section 10, likewise, is absolutely needed because that is actually what allows for IVF to continue to exist. It does not exist without some clarification that the embryo does not, in fact, have personhood. If we do that, we will see the exact effects we saw happen in Alabama, which was providers are then effectively not going to be providing IVF because of that threat of liability. This really does provide those protections and the clarity in the law to ensure we can still access those types of procedures here in Nevada.

I cannot help but note the idea that somehow this is not a disease ignores some of the stories we have heard today. No one is at fault for this. The reason why we have included—and I would note in the bill, the places where we are acknowledging that infertility affects men and it affects women. It does not affect just one type of individual in Nevada. I also think that is

something you cannot control, and that is the whole purpose of this bill. It is the whole reason why we talk about IVF and ART; this is not somebody's fault, this is not something they did wrong, and this is just something they have to deal with.

To the extent there is some insinuation this is not some sort of disease, I just take exception with it. I would note for the Committee members, you heard from so many parents who talked about how hard this is, and we do not talk about it enough. We do not know about it enough because people are afraid to admit they tried to have a child and it just did not work. That stigmatization is really harmful and does not allow us to really address this. Dismissing this as something that does not affect people or somehow is their fault is exactly what burdens so many families who are going through this. It really does make it so much more difficult and isolating than it already is. With that, I am sure if Ms. Klein has anything brief to add on the cost of it with respect to adding coverage, I would turn it over to her.

Amanda Klein:

When we started this journey several months ago, we did receive the initial fiscal analysis, and we did our own independent fiscal analysis as well. We used real clinic data and real Nevada numbers as well as working with the American Society for Reproductive Medicine, a very well-known and well-respected organization. As a result, we found this type of coverage would roughly be about 67 cents per member per month, not \$9 or anything else we have heard today—67 cents per member per month.

While my story represents perhaps the extreme situation—multiple rounds of IVF, needing a surrogate, all of the above—the president of Nevada Fertility Advocates, who is not able to be here today, just needed some simple diagnostic testing. It is good to keep that in mind as well.

The other thing I will say is I have worked in health care and worked for health plans in this state for the last 20 years. While I am certainly not an expert on finance, I can tell you I have never seen my premiums go down. It would be really wonderful to see our premiums go toward something that makes a huge difference in thousands of lives in the state of Nevada.

I also heard the commentary around Medicaid, and why should we be adding coverage for Medicaid. We would be the first ones in the country. Yes, Nevada should be the first one in the country to offer this to their entire population.

Chair Marzola:

I will now close the hearing on S.B. 217 (R2). I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 317 (2nd Reprint). This measure revises provisions relating to industrial insurance. Good afternoon, Mr. Mills.

**Senate Bill 317 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to industrial insurance.
(BDR 53-625)**

Jason Mills, representing Nevada Justice Association:

Senator Daly, as you may be aware, is currently in another hearing and could not be here, so we are going to proceed without him. I want to say, for the record, we appreciate the work he has done on this.

Every session we try to get together with all the stakeholders in order to advance an omnibus workers' compensation bill that has the issues of claimants and injured workers taken care of and looked at, as well as the concerns from the industry, from insurers to self-insured, to large employers and small employers around the state. I can report to you we have worked hard these last several months to bring to you Senate Bill 317 (2nd Reprint). I appreciate all the hard work everyone has done, and I appreciate your time.

I realize the bill is long. I am going to present the bill and go through all of the sections quickly. I have Mr. Noble, Mr. Hooks, and Ms. Chambers here today. If there are any questions on any portions of the bill, we will have them ready for you. We are working off the second reprint that contains the sections of the bill. As you can see, sections 1 through 4 have been deleted by amendment [[Exhibit S](#)]. Sections 4.1 and 4.5 require a notice of 24 hours for businesses before inspections of their records. This has to do with safety concerns to make sure their personnel are there, et cetera.

Section 4.2 of the bill has to do with adjusting a payroll cap that has been in place since 1995, has not been adjusted for several decades, and has now been adjusted effectively with a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA). Section 4.3 removes a double bonding requirement in the statute against self-insured groups, as does section 4.4. Section 4.5 has to do with setting a 14-day window when these groups receive their assessments back from the state. There is a window of time of 14 days that those payments are paid back to them, which does not alter whether or not they are not paid. It is just the time window.

With regard to sections 4.6 and 4.7, these are conforming dates that have to do with changes we are making in the law to set those dates on September 1, 2026. Sections 6, 7, 8, and 9 have all been deleted by amendment. Section 9.3 allows for physician assistants to do follow-up care in industrial cases where the claimant expresses an agreement or authority for that to happen. Section 9.5 adopts a formulary system for medication in workers' compensation, and section 9.7 also allows for emergency-type scenarios for the use of nonformulary drugs where authorization is not required, as well as if there are any challenges by the doctors or the claimants. They have the right to go to court to challenge if there are any denials in that particular space.

Section 14 has multiple parts. There are requirements for the insurers' warrant: the doctors on their list will treat and accept workers' compensation treatment since it is their list, they update their list every September 1 through October 1. The doctors who cancel their

contracts with the insurers can be removed from the list every three years, and an industrial insurer can remove doctors from their list. But again, they must conform with the rules they warrant that all the doctors will accept and treat workers' compensation patients.

The state must update and require a format for all of the insurers to essentially say what the lists look like so they are all in a standardized format. However, due to cost concerns, there is a provision in there that basically indicates the state cannot compel the insurers to upload their lists into a proprietary software system. I will point out an amendment [\[Exhibit S\]](#) in a few minutes. There is an amendment that allows the state, nonetheless, to do that of their own volition should they so choose.

Section 15 of the bill deletes an old and nonused section of the police and fire heart and lung section, which essentially requires this crazy system of how you get second opinions for heart and lung examinations; it is a complete mess. We are removing that particular part of the existing law. Section 15.5 has to do with the formularies.

Sections 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26, and 31 have to do with the removal of the outdated managed care organization (MCO) appeal process, and the appeal process will just be the normal appeal process we already use in the work comp system. Section 17 allows, and this is a very important one, for the addition of psychological evidence and mental stress claims in workers' compensation cases to be able to be utilized. Most importantly, it allows not just psychiatrists to treat these claims but also psychologists, clinicians, and licensed marriage and family therapists, due to the shortage of the number of mental health care providers who exist in the workers' compensation space.

Sections 18 and 19 reference more language of the removal of the outdated MCO appeal process. Section 20 has to do with the hearings and appeals divisions keeping up a calendar of the hearings and the appeals on a government website. They are already doing this; this just statutorizes it. Sections 21 and 22 are more references to the removal of *Nevada Revised Statutes* 616C.305, which is the MCO appeals process I mentioned earlier. Sections 23 and 24 deal with stay motion rules and procedures that are treated differently all throughout the courts and the appeals process. This statutorizes and standardizes that process.

Sections 24 and 32 indicate we have a problem in the state where if there are any technical errors and petitions for judicial review, like it is in the wrong venue, et cetera, based upon existing Supreme Court case law, those cases are summarily dispensed with, whether that is a claimant who is pro per or an insurer who does not name the correct party. These appeals are just rejected, and we think that is exceptionally harsh. We have removed those sections, or we have altered the language to allow for the courts themselves to decide whether or not those faulty procedures would be in place, and they can lift them.

Section 26 deals with another aspect of the MCO appeals process being in the appeals division. Section 27 has to do with temporary partial disability payments and when they are requested, they would be paid within 14 days of receipt of the proof of that.

Sections 28 and 29 deal with the alteration of discovery rules in the workers' compensation system. Right now, it is a bit of a mess. We are looking to standardize that by adopting some standards and looking to the *Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure* to guide us somewhat.

Section 30 alters the ministerial time frames when the Division of Industrial Relations can reset the penalties on ministerial clerical errors insurers make, not on benefit penalties—work Senator Daly did last session. These changes do not amend or alter any of the benefit penalty systems we put in place that were altered last session.

Section 31 is the MCO language of updating the appeals process. Section 32 also deals with the petition for digital review dismissals on the improper misnaming or improper venue. Sections 32.3 through 35 deal with the effective dates. Section 34 is the repeal section we talked about briefly, and then we are turning to the amendments that are in front of you.

Section 4.5 [[Exhibit S](#)] is the separate document that is supplied. Section 4.15, as being amended, has to do with the representative who can now use electronic copies to provide to the Division when they are providing investigations of them. It is not just a hard paper format; very rarely do insurers use paper these days.

Nevada Revised Statutes 616B.0275 allows our largest employers in the state with self-insured private employees of more than 30,000 to adjust their claims out-of-state as long as they are providing their claims managers are accessible on Nevada time and Nevada dates. This is already the rule for large insurers in this state.

In regard to section 4.2, this was a change requested by the Department of Administration. I mentioned earlier with regard to the COLA change cap for the way the self-insured groups and the way the employees' policies are paid every year or how their fees are assessed in assessing these workers' compensation insurance policies. The state had a concern they did not know what the impact may or may not be. Basically, the changes allow for the state to keep the old cap or use the new cap, whichever cap they prefer; they are the sovereign entity; they can pick. The state was satisfied with those changes.

There are a couple of changes in section 14. We wanted to make clear when the insurers and administrators provide their formatted lists to the Division of Industrial Relations for their doctors, and is an exact copy, in an unaltered state, is provided by the Division of Industrial Relations and loaded up on its website. Section 14, subsection 12, has to do with the concession that all the industry and the claimants gave back to the state, where we did not want to bar the ability for them to upload their documents and data into the state. The state could not require them to do that with regard to their doctor list, so we added a provision here that the state can take that data and put it into their proprietary state system.

Rather than repeal NRS 616B.410, section 34 was to have amendments between the self-insured groups and the Division of Insurance (DOI). They talked about amendments rather than repealing it. It allows the language that satisfied the DOI and the self-insured groups. That is the entire bill. I have everyone here at the table ready to answer questions if you have them.

Chair Marzola:

I have a quick question on page 10, section 4.6, as it relates to the date. I thought you stated September 1, 2025, but the document itself states September 30, 2025. I just want to confirm it is September 30, 2025.

Jason Mills:

If I recall, this is the formulary implementation date.

Chair Marzola:

It is section 4.6.

Jason Mills:

I am sorry. Yes, it is September 30, 2025, when this ends. That is correct. On September 1, 2025, the portions I was talking about were the doctor provider list, not this section. My apologies.

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, are there any questions? [There were none.] We will start with support testimony of S.B. 317 (R2). Is there anyone here in Carson City wishing to testify?

Todd Ingalsbee, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada:

This is a great bill. We support it. We love the collaboration of everybody to make it better for our workers.

John Abel, Director, Government Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association:

I want to thank all the stakeholders and Jason Mills. We are in full support of this bill.

Paul J. Enos, Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Trucking Association:

I would like to thank our friends at the Nevada Justice Association for working with us on this legislation. It is rare businesses and organizations come together on something, but there are times when we can come to a grand bargain. Workers' comp has traditionally been one of those areas. We really appreciate the work on this bill and are in great support of S.B. 317 (R2).

Andrew MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:

We are echoing the comments previously made, but I do want to put on the record, thank you, Senator Daly, but in particular, Mr. Mills, Ms. Coolbaugh, and the team over at the Nevada Justice Association. This has been a lengthy process, something we have all come together with, and we completely agree on. I think the tilt of the axis of the earth has shifted a

few degrees because this is a tantamount change at the Legislature. I just want to make sure to put it on the record to thank them for working so diligently with us and please support the bill.

Harrison Porter, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Metro Police Managers and Supervisors Association:

I want to echo the support on behalf of the Las Vegas Metro Police Managers and Supervisors Association, which I represent. We support this bill.

Misty Grimmer, representing Nevada Resort Association; and Employers Insurance Company of Nevada:

I am wearing two hats today. First, the Nevada Resort Association is in support. Second, the Employers Insurance Company, since he was part of the presentation, he thought it would be weird to come back up.

Jason Gray, Vice President of Government Affairs, MGM Resorts:

I am here to testify in support of S.B. 317 (R2). A lot of really important consequential issues are addressed in this bill, and we are grateful for the compromise. It will help us and our ability to service our 45,000 Las Vegas team members, so I urge your support.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line for support testimony? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line for opposition testimony? [There was no one.]

[[Exhibit T](#) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

We will move to testimony in neutral. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral?

Adam Plain, Insurance Regulation Liaison, Division of Insurance, Department of Business and Industry:

We would like to thank all the participants and interested parties for working with us on the effective date of that wage cap change, as well as the self-insured group industry for working with us to not repeal a particular provision but instead amend it. The Division staff still finds some utility in it. Again, thanks to everyone involved, it was good collaboration. I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Mr. Mills, would you like to give any closing remarks? [Final remarks were waived.] I will close the hearing on S.B. 317 (R2). We will take a short recess.

[The Committee recessed at 3:50 p.m. and reconvened at 3:56 p.m.]

The Committee will come back to order. I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 173 (2nd Reprint). This bill establishes provisions relating to the environment. Welcome, Senator Neal.

Senate Bill 173 (2nd Reprint): Establishes provisions relating to the environment.
(BDR 52-585)

Senator Dina Neal, Senate District No. 4:

I am here to quickly present Senate Bill 173 (2nd Reprint). This is my omnibus environmental justice bill. It has several pieces in it, and I have been working with different stakeholders.

Section 2 talks about food delivery service and what you can opt out of in regard to disposable foodware and accessories. When I was talking to the Sierra Club, I believe in 2023, they were talking about all of the waste that goes on the side of the road when people order food and they just throw items away. I believe California is doing this, where basically it makes sure you are only getting what you need in order to eat your meal.

Section 6, the huge section, is the per-polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) language. I had a bill on PFAS in 2023. It was vetoed, and I am bringing it back relating to PFAS in certain products. There is a listing of products related to food packaging, juvenile products, carpet, and cookware and making sure these products are being limited in their use and labeled. Sections 5 through 26 is PFAS.

When we get into the middle of the bill, I get into heat islands. In section 29, I wanted to go after the heat islands happening and try to make sure the local government within their redevelopment areas are going to use 1 percent of their redevelopment agency (RDA) money in order to mitigate heat deserts. I was talking to Desert Research Institute (DRI), and this particular section is an attempt to try to formalize what we were doing around heat deserts and make sure we know they are nonprofits and local governments that may be participating, but there is not a formalized way in which we identify whether the trees are living or dying and make sure there is a true coordination between the seeds that were planted.

When I got into that particular portion of the heat desert, I was looking at Arizona, and there was a study that came up where Arizona had planted trees in order to mitigate heat, and they were the wrong trees. So I started asking the questions: Do we know what kind of seeds we are planting? Are we making sure the trees we plant are actually going to produce shade? Do we have a formalized process in which we do it? When I spoke to DRI, they were telling me, We do not actually, the Southern Nevada Water Authority may have the seeds, but we are not actually tracking whether or not the trees live or die. This allows for nonprofits and other groups to work together in order to create a formalized way. It also produces a grant they can apply for that 1 percent of the redevelopment money.

The final piece is in section 33.3. There was a young medical student who co-testified on the other side of the house. He is actually at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas School of Medicine, and he was deeply concerned about the microplastics that are in plastic food cutting boards. This is our amendment [[Exhibit U](#)] working with the Southern Nevada Health Authority and stakeholders in order to create some language where they can adopt protocols, which mimic protocols that already exist around how they go in and inspect surfaces that are being used to prepare food within a restaurant. That is the bill and, with that, I will open myself up for questions. It is a lot.

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, are there any questions?

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett:

It only has 37 sections; actually, it has 39. I think you could have gotten 45. I am a little disappointed, but next time. I did have a question in regard to the cosmetology components of this piece of legislation. I did not hear you talk about those in your presentation. If you could just hit on those.

Senator Neal:

I did forget; I just skipped right on over that. Currently, there is a congressional piece of legislation that has not passed trying to go after the use of formaldehyde in hair products. We know formaldehyde in hair products is causing cancer and other harmful conditions related to women or men who may use the hair products. I also threw in there—because a study came out where braided hair and weaved hair may have had lead components or other harmful chemicals—the bill is strictly limited to just retail stores that may be selling those products. I had to limit it down.

This will not be the Department of Cosmetology going to Walmart or Walgreens, but just actually to the retail stores that sell hair products to test to make sure (1) formaldehyde will no longer be in those products, and (2) to test braided hair or weaved hair to determine whether or not there is any other kind of coating that may have been produced on the hair that could then be a carcinogen or harmful to human life. Why this is possible is because the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) actually has a machine; they have part of the machine. This bill will allow them to purchase the additional piece so the Department of Cosmetology and UNR could then create an MOU [memorandum of understanding] to work together. Not only would UNR test the products but the Department of Cosmetology would inspect the retail spaces.

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett:

In the Senate, right now, would it be more pressed to purely set up the mechanisms for testing? Is it not banning the sale of those products, or is it banning the sale of those products?

Senator Neal:

This would be banning formaldehyde in hair products, but they do have to test and do an inspection because once the prohibition comes down, then a retail site would have to get rid of those products off the shelf, or that is the expected result.

Chair Marzola:

Following up on my colleague's question, what happens to all the money these small businesses that have bought all of this product and the substance is found? Those products are not being returned, and all the money they have spent—are we helping them in any way, or it is just we are taking these products because at this point they are banned?

Senator Neal:

The point is, if you are selling a product that has formaldehyde, which we know to be dangerous to the person who is using it, you have to remove that product because it is being stated it is harmful to a person who may be using a shampoo, gel, et cetera. There is no replacement product because it really goes after the entity actually manufacturing that and then telling them not to continue to manufacture that. For the retail store that hosts it, the Department of Cosmetology would go in there and inspect, and then they could potentially fine that store. But ultimately, the goal is to get those kinds of products off the shelf that have formaldehyde in them.

Chair Marzola:

I do understand that, Senator. If it is harmful to Nevadans, yes, it should be taken off the shelf. I guess my question was geared more toward what happens if you have a mom-and-pop small store? How can they replace these products? Do we have an avenue—and you and I can talk offline to just kind of brainstorm.

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett:

I have a lot of questions and concerns about this. It looks like we are only banning it for retail; salon services that might contain formaldehyde would then continue to take place? Or am I interpreting that wrong?

Senator Neal:

If it is not within a retail space, there was no capacity for the Department of Cosmetology to go and look everywhere. Clearly, there is a fiscal note attached to this measure, and I had to narrow the scope because originally they would have gone everywhere statewide in order to examine and inspect. That was not feasible, so it was limited.

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett:

We can take the conversation offline.

Chair Marzola:

I am going to have Legal clarify as far as the banning of the product.

Sam Quast, Committee Counsel:

The bill as written only provides for the testing of these products. There is no ban in the bill as written. This would set up a process where they are testing these products in these particular retail stores so they can get that information. There is nothing in the bill that makes it illegal to sell any of these products.

Chair Marzola:

Any additional questions, Committee members?

Assemblymember Anderson:

My question has to do with section 29. I think the heat index is an incredibly important thing for us to discuss. I am wondering if this is probability of precipitation capped as is done in other sections of the bill, or if this is for statewide information for the consideration of the heat islands in the redevelopment areas?

Senator Neal:

Section 29 only applies if the city has an RDA. It is whatever falls under *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 279. I purposely did it that way because those are mostly the blighted urban areas in which there is a need to talk about the urban island heat effect. I placed it also in the RDA because I needed to figure out a way to pay for it.

Chair Marzola:

Senator, did you say you wanted to address what Legal stated?

Senator Neal:

We can probably talk offline because I thought my original reprint had a banning of the product. We can just talk offline because when this was presented, I was not in the building. I just want to make sure there was no error from my original language in what I wanted to do. I did not want the formaldehyde to exist in the actual product. I just want to go back and look at the original of the second reprint and make sure something was not missed because that is what is throwing me off right now.

Chair Marzola:

With that, we will move to support testimony for S.B. 173 (R2). Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in support? You may begin when you are ready.

Olivia Tanager, Director, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:

The Sierra Club is the state's largest grassroots environmental organization. We are here in proud support for S.B. 173 (R2) and appreciate Senator Neal's work on this bill.

You heard there are a number of really great things in this bill to skip-the-stuff provision we are very excited about. We know exposure to plastic is really unhealthy for our communities. We know heat is really unhealthy for our communities. We appreciate this addresses urban heat. We know formaldehyde is really unhealthy for Nevadans. What I appreciate most about Senator Neal's approach is we know while all those things are harmful, they are

disproportionately harmful for many Nevadans, for low-income Nevadans, and for communities of color in Nevada. I really appreciate her approach to environmental justice and to phasing things out of Nevada that are harmful for Nevadans. With that, we urge your support.

Jackie Spicer, Coalition Coordinator, Nevada Environmental Justice Coalition:

We are in strong support of this bill today because environmental injustices take many forms, and we have to do everything we can to tackle these issues. While this bill is multifaceted, including banning things like PFAS chemicals forever and attempting to mitigate the urban heat island effect, we really do need to tackle all of these things.

To start, PFAS exposure and synthetic hair products have been linked to causing cancer and proven studies show that, as well as urban heat island effects. I am sure many of you are aware, we do have the two fastest-warming cities in the United States. It is really important we are doing everything we can to tackle this issue.

I also want to thank Senator Neal for including a provision on how we can continue to fund the DRI's work on this. We have been involved in their extreme heat working group for the last two years, which brings together jurisdictions in southern Nevada as well as service providers and advocacy groups, to try and tackle this critical issue. The funding is at stake because NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association, funding is at risk under the Trump Administration. In order to keep this critical work going in our state, we do need to have a way to fund it here. I appreciate that as well. Thank you so much for your time and dedication to the people of our state.

Sheila Bray, Director of Government and Community Engagement, University of Nevada, Reno:

We are written into sections 36 and 37, a little bit of what the Senator talked to, and so we are in great support of this bill. As you will see in section 36, we will help to develop the test that will identify those chemicals in hair braiding and such, and the section for identifying seedlings that are best planted within the southern urban island areas. We are in full support and thank you, Senator.

Jordan Chong, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am the youth legislator for Senate District 13, but I am speaking for myself here. I support Senate Bill 173 (2nd Reprint), and especially the provisions about hazardous PFAS chemicals in consumer products.

I have been researching PFAS for a couple of years at the University of Nevada, Reno, and in that time, I have learned just how harmful and pervasive these chemicals are in our products and in our environment. But I have also come to consider our regulations need to be conservative and well planned just because of how integrated they are in our economy. I really appreciate that rather than being a blanket ban, this bill focuses on the application of PFAS that are just simply unnecessary, and yet they pose the greatest risk of exposure to consumers.

We do not need forever chemicals in our takeout boxes, in our clothes, or in our cosmetics. Industry groups are right that phasing out these chemicals might be an involved process, but there is not a single product covered by this bill where a reasonable alternative cannot be found.

I also appreciate the focus on children's products in this bill. As a youth legislator, I represent the youth. Young children are highly exposed to PFAS because they put things in their mouths, and once PFAS is in a child's body, it is able to wreak havoc on their body for a very long time. The PFAS has been linked to health effects such as pediatric cancers. Please vote in support of S.B. 173 (R2).

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

You heard a little bit about our Nevada Heat Resilience Lab. We are happy to work with the cities and the redevelopment areas to try to combat the urban heat island effect.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line for support testimony? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition to S.B. 173 (R2). Is there anyone in Carson City?

Jay Parmer, representing Nevada Manufacturers Association:

The Nevada Manufacturers Association opposes S.B. 173 (R2), specifically the ban on intentionally added PFAS and its impact on current and future manufacturing in Nevada. Per-polyfluoroalkyl chemicals are ubiquitous throughout manufacturing processes for a reason. There is currently no replacement for the intentional use of PFAS for protection against heat, water damage, and other factors that cause parts and materials to fail, including, currently, firefighter uniforms.

The timelines for banning PFAS proposed in the bill are unworkable for existing manufacturers. The Nevada Manufacturers Association testified in the Senate Commerce and Labor Committee that while the manufacturing sector is taking steps to find alternatives to PFAS, there is no viable timeline for replacement of those chemicals recognized at this time. Large processors of PFAS chemicals continue to ship these products to manufacturing facilities around the country and plan to do so through at least 2028.

In fact, the use of PFAS chemicals has increased in certain manufacturing sectors, particularly synthetic garments, in order to increase fire-retardant properties that would otherwise place consumers at risk for burns when exposed to open flames. For these reasons, the Nevada Manufacturers Association continues to be opposed to the portion of the bill that requires a ban on intentionally added PFAS chemicals.

Chair Marzola:

Is there anyone else in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line?

John Keane, Manager of Government Relations, Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers:

We represent major portable and personal care appliances in the United States and Canada. This bill represents your power kitchen appliances. I just want to thank Senator Neal for engagement on this issue. We are here with concerns with S.B. 173 (R2) as currently written—which can be addressed and move to neutral in the amendment Senator Neal has proposed—section 25 would require manufacturers of cookware that potentially add PFAS to those products.

Cookware is defined very broadly as durable houseware products used in residential kitchens to prepare, dispense, or store food. This includes, without limitation, several products, including, without limitation, language. There is concern about what products would be incorporated into the labeling provision.

A couple of years ago, California enacted a similar cookware disclosure law, and during the deliberations on that bill, they removed the "not limited to" language. The removal of "without limitation" language would remove an area of uncertainty for cookware manufacturers. With that, we encourage the Committee to support the proposed amendment and remove the "without limitation" language to ensure complete compliance.

Chair Marzola:

Seeing no one else in opposition, we will move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line wishing to provide neutral testimony? [There was no one.] Senator, would you like to give any closing remarks? [Closing remarks were waived.] I will now close the hearing on S.B. 173 (R2).

[The Committee recessed at 4:21 p.m. and reconvened at 4:22 p.m.]

We will now come back to order. We will begin our work session on four of the bills we heard today. Pursuant to Rule 57.4, which allows a waiver of the 24-hour rule, Speaker Yeager has allowed us to waive the 24-hour rule. With that, we will start with Senate Bill 165 (2nd Reprint) which establishes provisions relating to behavioral health.

Senate Bill 165 (2nd Reprint): Establishes provisions relating to behavioral health. (BDR 54-145)

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, any discussion? [There was none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 165 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CARTER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 165 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Cole. Next is Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint), which makes revisions relating to reproductive health care.

Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint): Makes revisions relating to reproductive health care. (BDR 40-24)

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 217 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CARTER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 217 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBERS COLE, HARDY, KASAMA, O'NEILL, AND YUREK VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMEMBER YEAGER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Roth. Next is Senate Bill 317 (2nd Reprint), which revises provisions relating to industrial insurance.

Senate Bill 317 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to industrial insurance. (BDR 53-625)

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Senate Bill 317 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER COLE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 317 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Yurek. Next is Senate Bill 389 (2nd Reprint), which revises provisions relating to the administration of pharmacy benefits under Medicaid and certain other health plans.

Senate Bill 389 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the administration of pharmacy benefits under Medicaid and certain other health plans. (BDR 38-240)

Chair Marzola:

Committee members, any questions? [There was none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 389 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 389 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CARTER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Hardy. That ends our work session for today. I will now open up for public comment. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the line for public comment? [There was no one.] That concludes our meeting for today. This meeting is adjourned [at 4:26 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Denise Dimarzo
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblymember Elaine H. Marzola, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 170 (R2)	C	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 231 (R1)	D	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 344 (R1)	E	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 376 (R1)	F	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 63 (R1)	G	Various individuals, Equipo Academy, Las Vegas, Nevada	Letters in support
S.B. 63 (R1)	H	Michael Morton, Special Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General	Fact Sheet
S.B. 63 (R1)	I	Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General	Email referencing news articles
S.B. 63 (R1)	J	Donch'e King, Criminal Justice Supervisor, Office of the Attorney General	Letter in support
S.B. 63 (R1)	K	Aodhan Downey, State Policy Manager West, Computer & Communications Industry Association	Testimony in opposition
S.B. 63 (R1)	L	Jose Torres Casillas, Deputy Executive Director, California and Southwest Region, TechNet	Testimony in opposition
S.B. 63 (R1)	M	Nicole Lopez, Director and Associate General Counsel, Global Litigation Strategy, Meta Platforms, Inc.	Letter in opposition
S.B. 63 (R1)	N	Robert Singleton, Senior Director of Policy and Public Affairs, Chamber of Progress, Meta Platforms, Inc.	Letter in opposition
S.B. 63 (R1)	O	Meta Platforms, Inc., Snap Inc., X Corporation	Letter in opposition

S.B. 172 (R2)	P	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
S.B. 217 (R2)	Q	Jennifer Atlas, Government Relations Director, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network	Letter in support
S.B. 217 (R2)	R	Jenny Stepp, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Letter in support
S.B. 317 (R2)	S	Jason Mills, representing Nevada Justice Association	Proposed amendment
S.B. 317 (R2)	T	Denise Feldman, Private Citizen, Encino, California	Letter in opposition
S.B. 173 (R2)	U	Senator Dina Neal, Senate District No. 4	Proposed amendment