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

Eighty-Third Session
March 24, 2025

The Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Elaine H. Marzola at 1:36 p.m. on Monday, March 24, 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:

Assemblymember Bert K. Gurr, Assembly District No. 33
Assemblymember Tanya P. Flanagan, Assembly District No. 7

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst
Sam Quast, Committee Counsel
Daniel Peinado, Committee Counsel
Logan B. Service, Committee Manager
Cynthia Ihejirika, Committee Secretary
George Whalen, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Peter Saba, Senior Manager, Government Affairs, Nevada Restaurant Association
Tray Abney, representing National Federation of Independent Business
John Abel, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association
Mark Maynard, Private Citizen
Tom Clark, representing Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce; and Nevada Society of Certified Public Accountants
Nick McMillan, Co-Chief Executive Officer, Golden Steer Steakhouse, Las Vegas, Nevada
Misty Grimmer, representing Nevada Resort Association
Ashley Garza Kennedy, Principal Management Analyst, Government Affairs, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County
Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada
Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Michael Hillerby, representing Independent Payroll Providers Association
Robin Imbrogno, President and Chief Executive Officer, The Human Resource Consulting Group, Seymour, Connecticut
Nick Schneider, Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Richard P. McCann, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition; and Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees
Kristin Grammas, Director, Crime Scene Investigations Section, Criminalistics Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Sabrina Steinmetz, Senior Crime Scene Analyst, Crime Scene Investigations Section, Criminalistics Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Samantha Halm, Crime Scene Analyst, Crime Scene Investigations Section, Criminalistics Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Glezzelle Tapay, Senior Crime Scene Analyst, Crime Scene Investigations Section, Criminalistics Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Tabatha Paine, Crime Scene Analyst Supervisor, Crime Scene Investigations Section, Criminalistics Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Carla Scott, President, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees

Bobbie West, Vice President and Treasurer, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees
Michelle Kmetz, Secretary, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees

Chair Marzola:
[Roll was taken. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] Welcome, everyone here with us today in Carson City, those joining us in Las Vegas, and those tuning in over the Internet. Today, we will hear three bills, Assembly Bill 142, Assembly Bill 375, and Assembly Bill 430. We will also conduct a work session to take action on measures the Committee has heard in previous meetings. I will be doing the work session first and I will not be taking the Assembly bills in order. We will start with Assembly Bill 12.

Assembly Bill 12: Revises requirements for obtaining judicial review of a decision of the Board of Review concerning a claim for unemployment benefits. (BDR 53-309)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 12 revises requirements for obtaining judicial review of a decision of the board of review concerning a claim for unemployment benefits [Exhibit C]. It was sponsored on behalf of the Employment Security Division of the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation and heard on February 19, 2025. There are no proposed amendments.

Chair Marzola:
Committee members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 12.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 12.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Anderson. Next is Assembly Bill 21.

Assembly Bill 21: Revises provisions relating to unemployment compensation. (BDR 53-308)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 21 revises provisions relating to unemployment compensation [Exhibit D]. This is sponsored on behalf of the Employment Security Division of the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation and was heard on February 19, 2025. There are no proposed amendments.

Chair Marzola:
Members, are there any questions on Assembly Bill 21? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 21.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 21.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Hardy. Next is Assembly Bill 38.

Assembly Bill 38: Revises various provisions relating to housing. (BDR 43-521)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 38 revises various provisions relating to housing [Exhibit E]. It is sponsored on behalf of the Housing Division of the Department of Business and Industry. It was heard on February 26, 2025. Steven Aichroth, administrator of the Housing Division, proposes the following amendment: (1) amend the bill to remove all references to "travel trailers" in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 489; (2) amend the bill to add additional requirements regarding the investigation by the administrator of the actions of a licensee and the confidentiality of a complaint and other information received by the Housing Division under the provisions of NRS 489.431; (3) amend section 9 of the bill to remove provisions that provide the manufactured building for which a certificate and label of compliance has been issued is not required to comply with certain local building codes and ordinances; (4) amend sections 13 and 14 of the bill to remove the requirement that a contract for sale be provided to the Housing Division by a dealer, in addition to a completed dealer's report of sale, for sales of new, used, or rebuilt manufactured homes, mobile homes, manufactured buildings, commercial coaches, or factory-built housing; (5) delete section 36 of the bill and remove section 39 to conform with the deletion of section 36; (6) amend subsection 1(a) of section 37 of the bill; (7) amend subsection 1(b) of section 37 of the bill; (8) amend section 38 of the bill to add "and unless the rental agreement or lease states otherwise"; and (9) amend section 40 of the bill to delete "seller or transferor" and replace with "buyer or transferee."

Chair Marzola:
Committee members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 38.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 38.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER YUREK SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Carter. Next is Assembly Bill 215.

Assembly Bill 215: Revises provisions relating to employment. (BDR 53-132)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 215 revises provisions relating to employment [Exhibit F]. It is sponsored by Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno and was heard on March 19, 2025. There are five proposed amendments from the sponsor and that is to: (1) add Assemblymembers Hibbetts and Moore as primary cosponsors; (2) amend subsection 1 of section 2 of the bill to reduce from 48 to 40 the hours in any one week a child under the age of 16 years of age may be employed, permitted, or suffered to work at any gainful occupation with certain exceptions; (3) amend subsection 2 of section 2 of the bill to add stage production or theatrical performance, lifeguard at a pool, and an employee in an arcade to those occupations that are exempt from the prohibitions set forth in subsection 2; (4) amend subsection 2 of section 2 of the bill to change the time period that a child is not permitted to work to 11 p.m. through 6 a.m. on any night immediately preceding a school day; and (5) amend subsection 2(b) of section 2 of the bill to clarify the provisions prohibiting the employment of children applies to those who are 16 years of age and under 19 years of age, who are enrolled during a current academic year in a public school, private school, or charter school.

Chair Marzola:
Members, are there any discussions on the bill? [There were none.] I will take a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 215.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 215.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno. Next, we will move to Assembly Bill 231.

Assembly Bill 231: Requires a service contract to impose certain duties on the provider of the service contract. (BDR 57-655)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 231 requires a service contract to impose certain duties on the provider of the service contract [Exhibit G]; was sponsored by Assemblymember Hunt and Senator Neal; and heard on February 24, 2025. There are three proposed amendments: (1) amend subsection 1(g)(2) of section 1 to specify that the allowance to a holder of a service contract for sleeping accommodations at a hotel is based on a nightly rate of the United States General Services Administration per diem for lodging; (2) amend subsection 1(g)(2) of section 1 of the bill to add "a furnace or heater" that is covered under a service contract, thereby subjecting a furnace or heater to the same requirements set forth in the bill as an air conditioner; and (3) amend the bill to clarify the measure applies only to home warranty contracts.

Chair Marzola:
Members, are there any questions?

Assemblymember Kasama:
I want to put on the record that there is so much about this bill that I like, so many things that can be improved upon. I still have some concern with some of the hard requirements that might be impossible for some of the businesses to reach, even if they were committed to doing it. With that, I will be a no and some of my colleagues will as well.

Chair Marzola:
Is there anyone else? [There was no one.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 231.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 231.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Hunt. Next is Assembly Bill 305.

Assembly Bill 305: Limits the amount a provider of health care may charge for filling out certain forms associated with certain leaves of absence. (BDR 54-665)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 305 limits the amount a provider of health care may charge for filling out certain forms associated with certain leaves of absence [Exhibit H]; was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor, and heard on March 10, 2025. There are two proposed amendments: (1) amend section 1 of the bill to increase the maximum amount that a provider of health care may charge from $10 to $30; and (2) require the maximum amount to be adjusted each calendar year in an amount corresponding to the percentage of increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index published by the U.S. Department of Labor for the preceding year; and require the Department of Health and Human Services to, on or before January 1 of each year, determine the amount of the adjustment required and post that adjusted amount on its Internet website.

Chair Marzola:
Assembly members, are there any questions on Assembly Bill 305? [There were none.] I will take a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 305.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 305.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblymember O'Neill:
I am going to vote to get it out of the Committee and onto the floor. In the meantime, I want to do a little more work with talking to some of the physicians in the industries about this issue.

Chair Marzola:
Is there anyone else? [There was no one.] I just want the Committee to know that after I presented this bill, I did have a chance to sit with the Nevada State Medical Association. The new amendments that you see today—that I did accept—are their amendments. I just want to put on the record that they are now in support.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to myself. Next is Assembly Bill 371.

Assembly Bill 371: Enacts the Cosmetology Licensure Compact. (BDR 54-835)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 371 enacts the Cosmetology Licensure Compact [Exhibit I]; it is sponsored by Assemblymember Torres-Fossett and was heard on March 17, 2025. There are no proposed amendments.

Chair Marzola:
Members, are there any questions on Assembly Bill 371? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 371.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 371.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblymember Cole:
While I appreciate all of the various compacts that we have been looking at, for this one the reciprocity is already happening. It does not seem like we have the pipeline issues that we do in the other areas. I will be a no on this one.

Assemblymember O'Neill:
Ditto.

Chair Marzola:
Is there anyone else? [There was no one.]

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Torres-Fossett. Our final work session bill is Assembly Bill 413.

Assembly Bill 413: Provides for the creation of the Southern Nevada Health Care Workforce Apprenticeship Pilot Program. (BDR S-317)

Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 413 provides for the creation of the Southern Nevada Health Care Workforce Apprenticeship Pilot Program [Exhibit J]; it is sponsored by Assemblymember Nguyen and was heard on March 19, 2025. There are two proposed amendments: (1) amend the bill to replace the Department of Business and Industry with the Southern Nevada Local Workforce Development Board, also known as Workforce Connections; and (2) amend subsection 2(b) of section 1 to replace "to" with "for."

Chair Marzola:
Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 413.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 413.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Nguyen. That will conclude our work session for today. I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 375. Welcome, Assemblymember Yeager and Assemblymember Gurr.

Assembly Bill 375: Revises provisions relating to intoxicating liquor. (BDR 32-1049)

Assemblymember Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9:
It is an honor to present Assembly Bill 375 to you this afternoon. With me at the table is Assemblymember Gurr and Peter Saba from the Nevada Restaurant Association. With your permission, Chair, Assemblymember Gurr and I will make some opening remarks and then we will hand it over to Mr. Saba to take you through the bill and some amendments.

I first wanted to wish the Committee members a happy Basque Heritage Day at the Legislature. I also want to let you know, happenstance has it that it is also National Cocktail Day, which makes this a very fitting day to hear Assembly Bill 375. Before I get started, I will note there has been a lot of interest in this bill and, admittedly, there is still a lot of work to do on this bill. We look forward to this hearing this afternoon and continuing to work with interested parties to get this bill where it needs to be to earn this Committee's support. As you will hear later, we do have some amendments [Exhibit K]. The amendments always seem to generate additional concerns from folks, so we welcome that input, and we look forward to continuing to work on it.

You all might remember alcohol deliveries were allowed during the COVID-19 pandemic. This bill seeks to provide a statewide framework for alcohol delivery that local governments—and I want to repeat this—local governments would be able to opt out of or enact further restrictions or requirements. Let me tell you about the three main goals of the bill: (1) to help our small businesses and restaurants in what is a very challenging economic climate we find ourselves in; (2) provide convenience for customers and to disincentivize them to drive under the influence when they might be legally impaired but want another drink or two; and (3) provide a new source of revenue for driving under the influence (DUI) enforcement and education.

I have said this before in lots of committees and I will say it again, the most effective deterrent to criminal activity is the chance of getting caught. It is not the penalty; it is the chance of getting caught. That is why the money generated from this bill will go to the DUI prevention and education efforts enumerated in *Nevada Revised Statutes* 484C.454. I am still working with folks to figure out whether that language in the bill should be more prescriptive or whether that money should be shared with other entities focused on this work. I think we are all interested in trying to cut down on the amount of impaired driving that is happening on our roadways.

Finally, the very last section of the bill designates the traditional Basque drink, the Picon Punch, as the official state drink of Nevada. We thought there was no better day to hear this bill than Basque Heritage Day at the Nevada Legislature. The designation as the official state drink is more than just a title; it is a recognition of the deep and lasting contributions of Nevada's Basque community and, more broadly, of the immigrant communities that have shaped our state.

The Picon Punch is not just a cocktail; it is a cultural tradition that has endured for generations. It made its way to the American West through Basque immigrants who carried their traditions with them as they settled right here in Nevada. In places like Reno and Elko, the drink became a cherished part of the Basque American experience, a symbol of heritage, unity, and resilience. Louis' Basque Corner in Reno, JT Basque in Gardnerville, the Star in Elko, and many beloved establishments have kept this tradition alive, ensuring that the Picon Punch remains a connection to the past and a celebration of community.

What makes the Picon Punch special is not just its history, but what it represents. In Basque culture, it is traditionally served before dinner, not as a means of excess but as a way to bring people together. It is a testament to the values of camaraderie, moderation—if you do it right—and tradition; values that extend beyond the Basque community and into the very fabric of Nevada's diverse culture. Chair, that concludes my remarks and with your permission, I would now like to hand it over to my colleague, Assemblymember Gurr.

Assemblymember Bert K. Gurr, Assembly District No. 33:
I represent the largest district in Nevada and probably where an awful lot of sheepherders drank a lot of wine and Picons. Assemblymember Yeager covered a whole bunch of what I was going to say, but there is another part of it that is really, really important.

This bill has been introduced and tried to make the Picon an official drink over the years. One of the hangups was that the main ingredient in the Picon was not made in the United States. Well, now there is no better time to make this designation official. Our very own Ferino Distillery in Reno has recently acquired the global rights to the Amer liqueur, the key ingredient in Picon Punch, and will be distilling it right here in Nevada.

This is a historic moment. Not only is Nevada home to rich Basque culture, but now we will be the source of this vital piece of our heritage. Making the Picon Punch our official state drink is a perfect way to honor this legacy while celebrating our state's future as a leader in craft spirits and cultural preservation.

Today in the audience, we are fortunate to have with us Mark Maynard, who is the documentarian behind *Piconland: The Quest for the Perfect Picon Punch*. As I said on the floor, I hope he did not have to drink at every place he went to do that. His film captures the significance of this drink in Nevada's history and the passion behind preserving its tradition. His work highlights the Picon Punch as more than just a cocktail. It is a symbol of identity, community, and the enduring legacy of our Basque heritage. This afternoon, as we reflect on our traditions that make Nevada unique, let us honor the Basques and embrace the values of unity and heritage that define our great state. Let us solidify Picon Punch's place in Nevada.

Assemblymember Yeager:
Chair, with your permission, I would like to hand it over to Mr. Saba, who has a PowerPoint presentation to take you through some of the technical details of the cocktails to-go portion of the bill.

Peter Saba, Senior Manager, Government Affairs, Nevada Restaurant Association:
I am here today on behalf of thousands of Nevada's small-business owners, employees, and restaurant families to proudly introduce Assembly Bill 375, a bill that is pro-business, pro-safety, and pro-Nevada. Assembly Bill 375 modernizes Nevada's liquor laws by allowing restaurants to safely sell and deliver alcohol to-go, just like big chain grocery stores and liquor retailers already do. This is not about cutting corners; it is not about weakening oversight. It is about leveling the playing field, supporting our restaurant industry, and implementing a policy that is smart, regulated, and modern. Across the country, over 30 states still have alcohol to-go laws and the results are clear: businesses have grown, jobs have been protected, and public safety has not been compromised. Assembly Bill 375 ensures that Nevada does not get left behind. It delivers a balanced solution, one that strengthens our economy, respects local control, and builds in the kind of strict safeguards Nevadans expect and deserve.

Assembly Bill 375 modernizes Nevada's liquor laws in a way that is both responsible and fair [page 2, Exhibit L]. It allows restaurants to sell and deliver mixed drinks to-go in sealed and tamper-evident packaging, ensuring customers enjoy the same convenience already available from liquor and grocery stores. For too long, Nevada's restaurants have been held to a different standard and A.B. 375 changes that. It levels the playing field while preserving strong safeguards. This bill does not remove oversight; it enhances it. Every step includes a safety check, and every actor is accountable.

Under section 1, subsections 1(a) and 1(b), licensed restaurants and third-party delivery services are permitted to sell and deliver alcoholic beverages only within jurisdictions where they are licensed to operate. That means local control remains intact. Section 1, subsection 2

establishes mandatory tamper-evident packaging which provides clear proof of compliance. These seals do not just protect businesses, they also protect responsible customers from open container violations and give law enforcement a simple, visual standard for compliance.

Under subsection 3, the bill directs the Department of Taxation to establish and enforce safeguards: subsection 3(a): driver training and alcohol education certification; subsection 3(b): use of age verification technology with time stamp delivery records; subsection 3(c): deliveries must originate from the restaurant and occur only during regular business hours; subsection 3(d): promote coordination with local enforcement to ensure uniform statewide compliance; and subsection 3(e): establish a 50-cent surcharge on every alcohol to-go sale dedicated to DUI prevention through the Ignition Interlock Device program, which funds DUI enforcement treatment assistance, law enforcement training, public outreach, and the statewide case management and tracking system, directly supporting the reduction of impaired driving in Nevada.

Subsection 5 protects local autonomy, giving municipalities the power to opt out depending on what is best for their communities. Subsection 6 gives the Department the ability to enforce penalties, including fines or suspensions, for businesses that do not comply. Proudly, section 5 designates Picon Punch as the official state drink.

This bill is not a patchwork fix. It is a modern, enforceable, and tested regulatory framework; one that meets the moment. Assembly Bill 375 is not an experiment. It is tested, responsible, and a necessary step forward.

In 2020, when restaurants were forced to close their dining rooms during the pandemic, Nevada temporarily allowed alcohol to-go [page 3]. Like many states, we saw the benefit immediately. Restaurants were able to stay afloat, workers were able to stay employed, and consumers—who were already ordering food for take-out—were given a responsible, safe way to enjoy beverages at home. That temporary measure ended here in the state. In the years since, more than 30 states have adopted long-term alcohol to-go policies, including states like Texas, New York, California, and Florida. They have moved forward; Nevada has not and that is what A.B. 375 aims to change.

We are not asking the Legislature to make a speculative decision [page 4]. The demand is already here. Nationally, over 90 percent of restaurants in states where alcohol to-go is legal now offer it, and more than half of consumers say it influences their take-out decision. Food alone is not enough. For many restaurants, alcohol makes up to 80 percent of profit margins while food averages just 5 percent. Without that margin, many restaurants simply cannot stay open. Assembly Bill 375 creates an equitable opportunity for restaurants to survive and grow. It supports workers, it responds to consumer demand, and it does all of this without compromising public safety.

Nevada's restaurant industry plays a critical role in our state's economy [page 5]. It generates nearly $32 billion in annual economic activity. It contributes about $2 billion in state tax revenue and nearly a half billion dollars at the county level. More than 223,000 Nevadans—

12 percent of our state's workforce—depend directly on this industry. These are not just numbers; these are jobs, these are family-owned restaurants, these are Nevadans who work as servers, bartenders, line cooks, and delivery drivers; real people who stand to benefit directly from this bill.

The voices of Nevada's business owners tell the story the best [page 6]. Mimi Butler, who owns Buenos Grill, called alcohol to-go "a whole new market that was not there before." Derek Stonebarger, owner of ReBar, said it gave him the opportunity to showcase unique liquors and locally made products like Smoke Wagon; products the big box retailers do not carry. Kyle Vannucci of Michoacan Mexican Restaurant, said it best, "being able to sell our signature margaritas to-go gave us a way to stay connected with customers." Nevada's restaurants want this option, and the consumers are ready for it.

Assembly Bill 375 requires all to-go alcoholic beverages to be sealed with tamper-evident packaging [page 7]. It is not about locking down a drink until it gets home; it is about setting a clear, visible standard that protects everyone involved. Tamper-evident packaging across every industry has one purpose: to show whether something has been opened or altered. It does not stop intent; it does not need to. What it does is create a point of proof, something objective, something visible, and something enforceable.

Let us be honest here: anyone determined to drink behind the wheel can already walk into the 7-Eleven, buy a $2 tall can, or pour vodka into a Hydro Flask. This behavior exists with or without this bill, but what this bill does is protect the people doing the right thing. That includes the honest, law-abiding customer who picks up dinner and a cocktail to-go, drives straight home, and never opens the drink in the car.

Tamper-evident packaging gives them that protection. It clearly shows this was sealed when it left the restaurant. It is not something new; it is not something that needs to be complicated. It is the same trusted system we use every day from the salads you get at Trader Joe's to the security tape you cut through to open your Amazon package. It is not about stopping intent. It is about setting a clear standard of accountability, one that law enforcement, businesses, and customers all recognize instantly. It protects law enforcement by giving officers a clear, visual cue. It protects restaurants and delivery drivers by showing they followed the law. Most importantly, it ensures that if someone chooses to violate the law, they, and only they, are held accountable; not the restaurant that followed every rule, not the delivery driver who verified the ID, and not the bill that made the service possible. This is a practical, proven safeguard. It does not pretend to prevent bad behavior. It gives everyone involved the tools to act responsibly and be protected when they do.

In addition to everything already built into this bill, we also have the advantage of using systems that are already working right here in Nevada [page 8]. Third-party delivery platforms like Uber Eats, DoorDash, and Grubhub already use multistep ID verification protocols, and they have been doing so successfully in the state for more than five years. When delivering alcohol from grocery stores and liquor stores, these systems require

scanning a government-issued ID, verifying age at the point of delivery, and confirming the recipient is physically present. No alcohol is left at the door; no delivery is completed without a verified ID.

These are not pilot programs or untested ideas. They are already working every day here in the state under existing law. Assembly Bill 375 simply allows restaurants to use the same proven systems that grocery and liquor stores have been using for years. It applies tested technology to a new setting while maintaining the same level of accountability. Together, these safeguards make alcohol to-go not just legal, but safe, responsible, and fully enforceable.

When we talk about public safety, we do not need hypotheticals [page 9]. We can look at what is happening right now in our own backyard. Just last month, Nevada saw a 76 percent increase in DUI-related fatal crashes. The DUI fatalities rose by more than 60 percent compared to the same time last year. Washoe County saw an 83 percent spike; Lyon County had a 400 percent jump. We know that expanding access to alcohol brings questions and we share those concerns. That is why we looked at the data and not assumptions. Between 2019 and 2021, DUI fatalities rose 53 percent in states that prohibited alcohol to-go. In the states that allowed it, the increase was just 12 percent. That is not a coincidence. States that adopted responsible alcohol to-go policies with clear safeguards saw better public safety outcomes. It turns out when you give people the option to drink at home, they are less likely to take the risk of getting behind the wheel.

Assembly Bill 375 does not just follow that model, it goes further. It dedicates millions each year to DUI prevention programs. This does not just preserve safety; it funds it. Fatalities are only a part of the picture [page 10]. When we zoom out and look at overall DUI data from 2019 to 2023, the story becomes even clearer. In states that adopted alcohol to-go and delivery policies, DUI rates either declined or remained stable. In states that did not, DUI rates rose year after year. This tells us something critical: alcohol to-go is not a threat to public safety. In many cases, it is actually a tool to enhance it.

When you give people safe legal options, you reduce the likelihood they will choose riskier behaviors. Just as important, this strategy aligns with where Nevada is already going. The Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety, is currently updating the statewide plan for addressing impaired driving. That plan recognizes that we need modern tools, modern enforcement, and modern choices for responsible consumers. Assembly Bill 375 fits directly into that vision. It is not working against Nevada's public safety goals; it is helping us achieve them, and the data backs that up. Independent research from the R Street Institute, the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, all confirm the same thing: responsible alcohol to-go policy is not just good economics, it is a smart, enforceable, and public safety strategy.

Beyond improving public safety, A.B. 375 is a major economic driver for Nevada's restaurant industry [page 11]. Based on real-world case studies from restaurant partners, we estimate that the average licensed restaurant will sell just over 127 to-go drinks per week.

Now multiply that by roughly 3,450 licensed restaurants across the state, and you are looking at an estimated 438,000 alcohol to-go sales each week. Over the course of the year, that adds up to approximately 23 million drinks sold through safe, regulated alcohol to-go. At a very generous average of $10 per drink, that translates to $228 million in new restaurant revenue annually. This is not a hypothetical. It is rooted in real business behavior, real customer demand, and real operating data. That is real money flowing into our local economy, supporting jobs, and strengthening the communities that depend on our restaurant industry.

What does this mean for the state? With $228 million in projected new revenue, A.B. 375 will generate between $15 million and $19 million in sales tax revenue annually [page 12]. But there is another key piece: the IID [Ignition Interlock Device] surcharge. That money goes directly into the Ignition Interlock Device program, which funds DUI enforcement, treatment assistance, law enforcement training, public outreach, and a statewide DUI case management and tracking system. All of this happens without raising a single tax. This is policy that pays for itself while directly funding public safety.

Assembly Bill 375 does not just stabilize restaurants; it helps them grow [page 13]. By creating an estimated 5 to 10 percent increase in revenue, this bill gives restaurants the ability to hire, retain, and expand. That means more jobs for bartenders, servers, delivery drivers, line cooks, and everyone who powers Nevada's hospitality industry. In a state where over 223,000 Nevadans depend on food and beverage work, A.B. 375 helps ensure those jobs remain secure, stable, and growing.

We are not reinventing the wheel here [page 14]. More than 30 states have already passed similar legislation. They have seen increased revenue, they have seen strong consumer support, and they have seen no significant public safety issues. If we fail to act now, Nevada risks falling behind; but if we pass A.B. 375, we send a clear, forward-looking message: Nevada supports innovation, Nevada supports small businesses, and Nevada supports policies that are smart and safe. Other states are moving forward; Nevada should lead rather than lag behind. We already have the delivery systems; we already have the enforcement tools. What we need now is the policy. The policy that lets our restaurants compete, the policy that keeps our public safe, and the policy that keeps Nevada moving forward.

Assemblymember Yeager:
That concludes our formal presentation, and we would be happy to answer questions at this time.

Assemblymember Jauregui:
I am excited about this, mainly because I remember having a conversation with a small restaurant in my district who never fully recovered the in-guest experience post-COVID-19. They said they went from being a dining-in restaurant and some delivery to now mainly being a delivery restaurant. You can go in there and eat, and you see people coming in and picking up orders to deliver nonstop. You mentioned in your remarks that 50 percent of their gross profits come from the sale of alcoholic beverages, so it makes me happy for the small restaurants in my district.

I do have a couple of questions. Maybe this is already standard practice, in section 1, subsection 3(a), where it says they must have a valid alcohol education card, is that something that is going to be created by the Department of Taxation? I know that is who is going to be overseeing this, or does that already exist somewhere else?

Peter Saba:
It would just fall under the current statute of a Techniques of Alcohol Management (TAM) Card, a ServSafe Alcohol Card, and I believe there are a couple other options that are allowed to be used by the state as legal alcohol training.

Assemblymember Jauregui:
I have been through the multistep verification process in other states. I have been to states where they have this available and it is not just for restaurants, it is for any delivery type of service like Instacart. This is probably more of a question for the sponsor, but is the plan to possibly extend this to other delivery services other than restaurants, like groceries? If you get your groceries delivered, you can also get your bottle of wine or your case of beer delivered with it and include that same multistep delivery verification process.

Peter Saba:
This is something that is currently legal in most jurisdictions across Nevada. In 2021, Senate Bill 307 of the 81st Session, sponsored by Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, allowed retail stores and liquor stores to deliver. They are currently allowed in the state—just not restaurants.

Assemblymember Jauregui:
It is my understanding that is if you are ordering directly from Total Wine or the wine outlet or something. There are no delivery services, like Instacart or DoorDash would not be able to deliver from a store, right? Only direct delivery by that retailer.

Peter Saba:
No, if you go on Uber Eats currently in North Las Vegas, you can get alcohol delivery from Albertson's and Smith's or Total Wine.

Assemblymember Cole:
I think it is very interesting, especially the Picon Punch. My question is in section 1, subsection 1(b), about the jurisdictions: where the person who has ordered, where the delivery will occur, and where the establishment is based. In my district, District 4, I have City of Las Vegas, City of North Las Vegas, and Clark County. I am wondering if that is going to really limit the scope of this. Is there a thought process that can add the expansion of multijurisdictional licensing in this area? I think that would be a really good place for this.

Peter Saba:
Since the State is already currently dealing with this, most of the local municipalities down south have adopted the grocery stores or retail stores, just not Clark County. They are working on getting that in negotiations. It has been four years that they have been working to

get that in negotiations, but they are currently already dealing with the same things. If a grocery store in Summerlin wants to deliver to Desert Inn behind the Convention Center, they know they cannot, and the apps currently do not allow you to get that delivery. When I was working on this bill, my apartment is right by the Convention Center, and I was trying to test all this out. That is how I figured that out. But when I put my old home address where I grew up in North Las Vegas, lo and behold, I was able to get it from a grocery store out there. Did I answer?

Assemblymember Cole:
Yes, you perfectly highlighted the issue. If you need any help from an Assembly person to fix this issue, I am here and ready.

Assemblymember Roth:
As someone who does not like to leave their house, I deeply appreciate this piece of legislation. My question is in regards to the public safety aspect. The table is very small in the handouts [pages 9 and 10, Exhibit L], and I just want to make sure I understand. In my experience, I can think back through caseloads and how many DUIs would not have made it to me had the person been able to have alcohol delivered to them, instead of wanting to leave their house—from a house party or whatever it is—to go get more alcohol. Can you dig into that data just a little bit more?

Peter Saba:
I actually tried, but I will try even harder to find that. That was a very important thing that I wanted to see here. I do wonder if there is data on the people who get picked to leave the party to get it from the grocery store, and that is how they end up getting a DUI or dying. I think that is very important data to find, and something we could stop through this bill. I will work on it.

Assemblymember Yeager:
I just want to add I think this is a good bill regardless, right? We live in a world of convenience, and we are used to overnight from Amazon, two days from Amazon. Obviously, public safety is important, but the intent here is: people are at home and they are drinking, whether by themselves or at a party. Then they are faced with this choice if they run out, and they are impaired when they are making that choice. I have seen cases when I was a public defender—I know you have seen them—where you think, this is probably not someone who would have made that choice if they had another option. It is hard to know how many people would make that choice.

It does seem to me, anecdotally, if you are at home, you are drinking, and you are ordering from your favorite restaurant—for me, that would be a Tacotarian or, I guess Esther's Kitchen does not deliver, we learned that in this Committee—to be able to tack on a cocktail or wine is going to drive people's behavior versus getting in the car driving there. Or, as Mr. Saba said, if you are at a party with a handful of folks, somebody is the poor person who is going to have to drive down to get more.

I do not know if we can quantify that, but just the human nature; we know how people think and act, and we want to make this as simple as possible for them when they are in an impaired frame of mind. They can just make a phone call, go on the app, and have it delivered and hopefully prevent some of this. We will continue to try to look for that data. I am sure it will drive behavior in that way.

Assemblymember O'Neill:
If I understand, we are at a bar and I am inebriated, if I order a drink, the bartender can cut me off even before he mixes the drink or pulls a draft for me. In this situation, where I am at home—I am over 21, so that is not the question—and the delivery person comes to me, they are supposed to verify or validate that I am not inebriated to such a position, and they could hold back the drink from me. Is that correct?

Peter Saba:
Yes, that is correct. That is something that Uber and DoorDash do through their company policy just for liability issues and stuff, but yes, they would refuse to hand over the alcohol to you if you are not coherent enough.

Assemblymember O'Neill:
The drink is still paid for, but I do not get it, correct? What does the driver do with it? This may be a subsequent bill.

Peter Saba:
I actually looked into this. The driver is paid back by the delivery company for their gas to go back and give it to the restaurant—or currently the grocery store and liquor store—and you, being the customer that ordered it, you pay a $25 fee that would cover that person's gas to go back, the taxes, and the fees that come out of something like this. The restaurant also gets that money back through that charge.

Assemblymember O'Neill:
Just for clarification, so I understand: you deny me, the driver takes it back to the restaurant, and they just throw it down the sink or something, but there are fees attached to it for that refusal.

Peter Saba:
Yes, that is the $25 fee. Just like you being a customer in the restaurant there, you found a hair in your food or did not like it or something, they would take it back, throw it out, or maybe some line cook is eating or drinking it.

Assemblymember Carter:
In section 1, subsection 3(a), are you talking about simply a TAM Card or is there a different type of training program envisioned and would it be platform specific? Could the platforms be allowed to develop their own training programs?

Peter Saba:
Currently how it is written if it is passed, it follows the certain statute that bartenders currently have to go through, which is the TAM Card or the ServSafe Alcohol Card. Being honest here, we are looking at certain amendments, where in other states they allow the delivery apps to do their own alcohol training through the app and not have to go through the State.

Chair Marzola:
Committee members, are there any additional questions? [There were none.] I have a quick question for a clarification. As far as the training now, I understand the TAM Card, but is there an extra training that comes into play because you are delivering the alcohol to people's homes? I have never had a TAM Card, maybe it is already part of the training, such as making sure you recognize someone is a little too intoxicated to keep drinking and things like that.

Peter Saba:
I have not gotten my TAM Card renewed since college, so currently, I do not know. I do know that the Uber and delivery apps, they do not just take the TAM Card of the ServSafe Alcohol Card, they also make you go through their company policy if you want to be a driver that delivers alcohol. I think that is where that portion will be covered on how to drive with it in states that allow it to be a closed container, if the seal is on, how to recognize if someone is inebriated, or make sure that the photo on the ID is that person there.

Chair Marzola:
I just want to make sure the policy comes with the training.

Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno:
Each platform will be able to develop their own training program, so there will be no consistency across the board. The only thing that will be consistent is the TAM card in the county that the TAM card is issued, but as far as anything else, is each platform going to make up their own training program?

Peter Saba:
These platforms already have made these trainings, and I am sure they all follow the same guideline, because it is more about saving the company's line. If the driver was to hand it off to someone who ends up throwing up in their sleep, that major lawsuit could cost millions for the delivery app. I am sure they probably go into it a little bit stricter than what we do here, but they do have to go through both of those: the state alcohol training and the company's training.

Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno:
You are sure, but you do not have any evidence to present to us today that there is a consistent platform training program.

Peter Saba:
I have not looked into it. That is an assumption, but I will look into it and send it over to you. What I can say is there has been no big form of miscompliance in 30 states that currently have it legal to the point where there is some motivation to repeal this kind of law. They have all been actually extending it or making it permanent in the past five years.

Chair Marzola:
Committee members, any additional questions?

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett:
I was definitely interested to hear about some of the information that pertains to the cocktails on the go. My question is about making the Picon Punch the state drink. Do we have any other state recognition for the Basque community? Do you know if we have any other state symbol that really recognizes the Basque community and our Basque heritage here in the state of Nevada?

Assemblymember Gurr:
I do not know that for sure, but I could phone a friend who could tell me, if you hold a second maybe. [Assemblymember Gurr spoke with someone out of audiovisual range.] For the record, that is J.B. Lekumberry, who owns JT Basque in Gardnerville. The answer appears to be no.

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett:
There is a lot of conversation about whether or not it is appropriate for Picon Punch or—I have heard conversations in the past about the "yard drinks" on the Las Vegas Strip—what gets to be the state drink here in the state of Nevada.

I do think this is a way for us to honor that Basque heritage in a way we have not yet done here in the state of Nevada. I really appreciate the cultural preservation we have done. I know the University of Nevada—Go Pack—has done quite a bit to preserve that culture with the Basque Studies program. I think this is a way for us to do it as a state and also to spread that information to ensure the next generation of Nevadans continues to learn about the impact of culture. Growing up in Las Vegas, I had never heard of the Basque community at all until I went to the University of Nevada, Reno. I think it is a great way for us to change that.

Assemblymember Gurr:
I appreciate that. On your desks or in your places, you should have had a complete breakdown by the professor of Basque studies about the Picon Punch [Exhibit M]. You can see how it progressed through the process. I also want to say it has been an honor to present this bill. I was stunned when Assemblymember Yeager asked if he could roll my bill into his bill, and it is truly a cooperative way to get this done. The Picon Punch is not frivolous. Do not ever take it that way. This is to honor their heritage and what they have done for us in the state.

Assemblymember Yurek:
Thank you all for the presentation on what I believe is a pretty exciting bill. Following up on my colleague's question that she just asked, other than making Nevada a little bit more spirited—no pun intended—are there any other elements of that? Because there is going to be competition for drinks as you have already highlighted, but are there any campaigns or any other educational or tourism thoughts of how we can incorporate—if this were to pass—in to ensure it is achieving its intended purpose of highlighting and celebrating Nevada's Basque culture?

Assemblymember Gurr:
No, but it is a great idea, I think that would be a great start. I know the tourism folks have used a lot of it in Elko County, Humboldt County, and probably in Washoe and Carson. Yeah, it would be a great start.

Chair Marzola:
Committee members, any additional questions? [There were none.] Thank you again for bringing this bill. Before I saw your PowerPoint today, I was like, well, if I order a dirty martini, how is that going to come? How is that going to be delivered? I appreciate the pictures and the bags.

We will move to support testimony for Assembly Bill 375. Is there anyone in Carson City who wishes to testify in support?

Tray Abney, representing National Federation of Independent Business:
I am here today representing the hardworking job creators of the National Federation of Independent Business Nevada, small-business owners. I want to thank my friends, Assemblymember Yeager and Assemblymember Gurr, for bringing this bill, and thank Mr. Saba for all his hard work, although I wish Mr. Saba would have invited me to all this research he did for this bill, but I will talk to him about that later. This is a lifeline to the restaurant industry, most of which are very small businesses. You all know the slim profit margins these folks operate on, so anything we can do to level the playing field for them, we greatly appreciate. Mr. Saba went through all the details of that; I do not need to outline any further.

Separately, on the Picon Punch piece—so I do not get in any trouble—I am not representing any client on this piece. I will tell you a lifetime ago, in a different life, different job, my first time in Nevada was not Las Vegas, it was not Reno; it was pulling into West Wendover, and then Elko, and having my first Picon at the Star in Elko, Nevada. I do not want to say it was life-changing, that is a little dramatic; but we think it is very important, certainly, to celebrate the heritage of that drink.

John Abel, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association:
I am a longtime 18-year law enforcement officer who has made my fair share of DUI arrests. I believe this bill will reduce DUI arrests and probably DUI deaths. For that reason, we support it.

Mark Maynard, Private Citizen:
I am a professor at Truckee Meadows Community College, but here today as a civilian. I am the director of the documentary film *Piconland: The Quest for the Perfect Picon Punch* and I am here to speak in support of section 5 of A.B. 375. The Picon Punch is more than a drink; it is a quest for those in Nevada, or those who come to Nevada from far and wide, to enjoy our high desert, mountains, waters, ghost towns, and bustling cities. It is a rite of passage. Anyone who has had a Picon remembers their first, where they were, and who they were with. It is generations of Elko residents who have had Scotty Ygoa, the owner of the Star, buy them their first Picon at the same place their parents and siblings had theirs. It is a ritual.

The Picon is a celebration of friendship, of good food, and of the blending of cultures: Basque and American, Italian and French, Spanish and Filipino, and uniquely Nevadan. Picons are rarely, if ever, sipped alone, and never in silence. They are part of gatherings that happen across the state every day at long communal tables and in century-old bars. They encourage the telling of stories and help us all find common values.

The Picon is a creation of the American West. It would not exist without the Basques who came here seeking a better life, but it does not belong to them alone because generations of Basques have literally invited Nevadans into their homes for hearty meals, kinship, and conversation. The Picon has come to belong to all Nevadans, a battle born tradition that deserves official recognition.

I am honored to have been able to learn so much about this drink and what it represents for this state. It has been my pleasure to share that story through film across the country and around the world. Our film played in Texas, Louisiana, France, and Albania, and it found a universal connection in all those places to their own cultures, and all those who saw it have expressed a desire to come to Nevada and try one for themselves.

Tom Clark, representing Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce:
I am here on behalf of the Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce very much in support of the cocktails on the go. We believe that restaurants having the ability to do so would definitely be a boost. You can get your packaged liquor and stuff delivered to your house. There is age verification, there are ways of doing that. We can see the same thing happening with the cocktails on the go.

However, as a native Nevadan, you cannot enjoy a Picon Punch that has been delivered to you by DoorDash. You must go to the JT, or the Star, or be somewhere and enjoy not just the cocktail, but the wonderful atmosphere and culture that the best people bring.

Chair Marzola:
I may be the only one in this room who has not gone to JT. I am going to solve that problem. Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support for Assembly Bill 375?

Nick McMillan, Co-Chief Executive Officer, Golden Steer Steakhouse, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I fully support A.B. 375 because it gives restaurants like mine, and across the state, the flexibility to meet the customer demand and really to acknowledge the permanent shift that has happened in the restaurant business after COVID-19. Of course, during COVID-19, virtually all restaurant business early on was delivery. We are a couple of years past that, and the shift has remained permanent. According to the National Restaurant Association, the number of transactions for delivery have more than doubled and stayed doubled since pre-COVID-19. Of course, a big part of dining is responsible alcohol enjoyment as well. On the business side, it is an integral part of the way restaurants make money. Combining the ability to sell and provide alcohol cocktails to-go alongside meals is a tremendous, tremendous lift for businesses like mine and all across the state. I fully support it.

[Exhibit N includes a collection of letters in support.]

Chair Marzola:
We will move to testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 375. Is there anyone here in Carson City?

Misty Grimmer, representing Nevada Resort Association:
First off, I think I am going to need to figure out how to get a couple of Picons delivered to the lobbyist room since I am up here opposing Assemblymember Yeager's bill. We have had some discussions with Assemblymember Yeager and Mr. Saba and appreciate his openness to continue those conversations and work on some amendments.

Nevada is different from other states in that we do have the resort corridors in the south and the north, and that does add an element into this conversation that is quite a bit different from a lot of other states. We do not have an issue with people being able to order a pitcher of margaritas along with their tacos when they are sitting at home having dinner. That is really not our fight. What our concerns are—that we do still want to keep working with Assemblymember Yeager and the sponsor on, though—are figuring out a way to have a prohibition for deliveries to the resorts and also making sure the local governments are ultimately the ones who still have control over this issue.

Ashley Garza Kennedy, Principal Management Analyst, Government Affairs, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County:
I just want to say we are in opposition to the bill as written. There is one amendment that will add in Clark County's ability to opt out of it, which we are appreciative, but we are still working through some of the other amendments as the Resort Association also mentioned. I just want to clarify that currently in unincorporated Clark County, we do allow liquor delivery from grocery stores, and we are currently in the process of an ordinance to allow liquor delivery from liquor stores and also delivery by a third-party app. That work is still ongoing in unincorporated Clark County. Opposed to the bill as written, still working with all the bill proponents on further amendments.

Chair Marzola:
Is there anyone else wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in neutral. Is there anyone here in Carson City?

Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada:
We are neutral on most of the bill. Section 5 is a really good idea. We are very concerned about how this is going to play into the current rules that we already have in place. Mr. Saba brought up Senate Bill 307 of the 81st Session from 2021. We are concerned that if we allow this process to go through the same one, it is going to be four or five years again before our restaurants have the ability to do this—that is, if the local governments are nice enough to opt in. We want to be able to continue the conversation with Assemblymember Yeager and figure out how we can provide this relief to Nevadans tomorrow.

Chair Marzola:
Is there anyone else wishing to testify in neutral on Assembly Bill 375?

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
Pardon me? May I testify in support? I apologize.

Chair Marzola:
Yes, absolutely. We will consider your testimony as support on the bill.

Cyrus Hojjaty:
Now that I heard the Resort Association opposed it, I am supporting it.

Chair Marzola:
We will now move back to neutral testimony. Is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] Assemblymember Yeager or Assemblymember Gurr, would you like to give any final remarks?

Assemblymember Yeager:
I want to thank Assemblymember Gurr for the Picon Punch portion of the bill and thank Mr. Saba from the Restaurant Association. We still have a little bit of work to do on this bill. I think some of the concerns you heard were obviously legitimate concerns. Clark County has been through this process, so we are going to try to work with them and we hope to have something in the very near future to bring back in front of this Committee.

Until then, I wish you a very happy Basque Heritage Day as well as a National Cocktail Day. There are Picon Punches available right across the street basically, so make sure if you have not had one, you get over there and try it.

Chair Marzola:
I will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 375. I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 430. Assemblymember Flanagan, welcome.

Assembly Bill 430: Exempts persons engaged in the provision of payroll processing services from provisions governing money transmission. (BDR 55-1072)

Assemblymember Tanya P. Flanagan, Assembly District No. 7:
I am the sponsor of Assembly Bill 430, which exempts persons engaged in the provision of payroll processing services from provisions governing money transmission. Payroll processing services handle tasks like calculating wages, managing tax withholdings, and making payments to employees and taxing authorities. They are often not considered money transmitters due to the specific nature of their operations and the reduced risk of harm to consumers. Payroll processing involves a specific regulated context, such as employer-employee relationship, and the funds are used for legitimate purposes including wages and taxes.

In 2023 the Legislature passed, and the Governor signed, Assembly Bill 21 of the 82nd Session, which was the Model Money Transmission Modernization Act (Model Act). Generally, a money transmitter is a person or entity that receives funds from one party for the purpose of sending them to another party. The act standardized the regulation of companies subject to money transmission laws and included providing payroll processing services within the definition of money transmission.

I represent District 7, and many areas of the state like mine are home to small businesses. This would support about 1,000-1,200 businesses that basically have about 20 employees or less. When this was presented to me by my copresenter today, Michael Hillerby, who is the director of legislative affairs for Kaempfer Crowell, I thought it was a good way to bring forward some legislation that would do good for small businesses. I am pleased to have him here with me and I am going to turn the mic over to him now.

Michael Hillerby, representing Independent Payroll Providers Association:
I am sure you would much rather still be talking about Picons rather than payroll, but here we are. I want to thank the Assemblymember and her cosponsors for getting us to the starting blocks with this bill. As you have heard, based on the Model Act that was passed last session by the Legislature, Nevada became one of the 27 states that have so far passed some or all of the model law which was created by the Conference of State Banking Supervisors. Based on the latest information we have, approximately half of those states have either gone back and amended out payroll provision or, once the industry got involved, excluded payroll provision from when the act was passed. There are another five states in process now: two have completed both houses—of the best information I have—and are on their way to the Governor. Three others are in process, like Nevada. We expect to see perhaps more this year.

Again, with the passage of the Model Act, it was the first time that payroll providers were included in the definition of money transmitters. The industry feels very strongly that was not appropriate. We have with us on Zoom, Robin Imbrogno, who is a member of the payroll providers group and a volunteer part of the government affairs committee to talk specifically about how payroll processors are already regulated and the oversight they have.

Robin Imbrogno, President and Chief Executive Officer, The Human Resource Consulting Group, Seymour, Connecticut:

First, I would like to thank Assemblymember Flanagan for having us here today and being our cosponsor on this. I am sure you would much rather that we are here talking about Picons and alcohol, but here we are talking about payroll. I am here on behalf of The Payroll Group and the Independent Payroll Providers Association.

Collectively, we represent over 300 payroll processors in the United States. Our members consist of small businesses around the country, including here in Nevada. We have around 1,200 firms in the industry code, accounting, tax preparation, bookkeeping, and payroll services. Since bookkeepers and accountants also provide payroll services, it is likely that number is even higher. Approximately 1,000 of those have less than 20 employees, which means about 90 percent of them are small businesses, as many of them are in Nevada. Small payroll companies, most of whom work hand in glove with the certified public accountant (CPA) community, provide essential services to Nevada businesses.

In addition to payroll processing and tax filing—as many people know—payroll processors, in general, provide a function that has as much of an advising component as it does to payroll processing. We work with small businesses to make sure they understand wage-and-hour laws, evolving sick leave laws, Family and Medical Leave Act laws, and much, much more. It was our community during COVID-19, in the small processing community, that worked with those business owners during the weekends and holidays to make sure they understood things like the Paycheck Protection Program (PPP), how to apply for PPP loans, how to use [unintelligible] credits for sick leave, and how to make those adjustments to their payroll taxes to keep their doors open. We explained how to make sure the PPP loans could be repaid using the reports that we had, the Restaurant Revitalization Fund, the Families First Coronavirus Response Act, sick leave pay, and even the Shuttered Venue Operators grants that were provided.

The payroll providing community, those small payroll companies, were still around when the large national firms would close their doors at 5 p.m. If Assembly Bill 21 of the 82nd Session stays enacted as it currently is, small payroll providers cannot continue to work in Nevada. It is just cost prohibitive for that community to meet the requirements of the bill as it currently stands. We have to comply with many laws and regulations as they currently exist in our community just to continue working with our banking partners as we currently do.

I want to share with you some of the things we have to do for our banks to stay in compliance. I will share with you what I have to do. Our bank right now requires us to provide a list on a quarterly basis under Know Your Customer, KYC. On a quarterly basis, we have to provide our bank with a list of all of our clients and their North American Industry Classification System number, which is basically sharing what industry they are in. Every quarter, we have to do that. In addition, we have to undergo an audit for the National Automated Clearing House Association (NACHA), this again goes to our bank. That audit, provided by an outside auditing firm, looks at all of our banking files to make sure we are in

compliance with NACHA. That means we have to show we have not done anything outside of what NACHA requires us to do with a banking file; that there have been no reversals out of compliance, we have stayed in line with everything NACHA says we need to do.

Our bank also requires that we go through an annual system and organization controls (SOC) audit. A SOC audit for a company our size can go anywhere from $25,000 to $50,000 a year. A SOC audit is an audit of our system and organizational controls, which is a framework created by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. It is basically looking at the financial and internal controls of an organization, which makes sure we care properly for other people's money. Every year the audit gets turned into our financial institution to make sure there are no flags and we are caring for other people's money appropriately.

In addition, any owner of a business like ours, mine included, has to provide a personal financial statement. They want to know where all of my money is or is not, and they make sure they know exactly where every penny is, so they understand what every dollar is, and they can ensure we have not done anything unscrupulous with our own personal finances. Anyone new going into an industry like ours, the barrier of entry, quite frankly, is fairly significant because they have to keep funds on deposit with banks to ensure they have covered any risk should a company or client we may work with go out of business and not be able to fund a deposit.

Finally, we have to do what is called an Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) review on our clients on a quarterly basis. We have to make sure through the Office of Foreign Assets Control, for money laundering that is an OFAC review, that people are not laundering money through a payroll account, they are legitimate, and we have to actually make sure they are only working in certain industries. In addition, we do annual credit checks on our clients and all of those are reviewed by the bank as well. We have to set credit limits for them and the banks review those credit limits as well. They look at those twice a year. They come to our offices, they review our offices and ensure that our brick and mortar is as good as the clients we serve.

Last, but not least—the CPA community wrote to you as well about this [Exhibit O]—the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) also confirms the Form 8655, which is a document all of our clients have to sign, allows us to work with a client on behalf of the IRS. That document basically shares that the electronic federal tax payment system, which is how we send federal tax payments on behalf of any client, notifies the client that at any time they can log into the IRS system and look at any tax payments made on behalf of the client. They should log in and check their federal tax payments that are being made on behalf of the client; they can check, if you will, behind us, and they are encouraged to do so. We have to notify clients on a quarterly basis that they can check behind us. We do that and the bank also checks that we do. The IRS also makes sure if an address change is made, the client is notified of any address change, so nothing can be done that is unscrupulous on behalf of the client.

These are all checks and balances put in place to protect clients and to protect the clients' employees to ensure everyone is well-protected. We protect our clients, and the bank makes

sure we are also being protected and funds are being protected. The reversal of this bill, which has been supported in so many other states, will allow us, and your CPA community as well, to continue to provide both education and high-touch services to these small businesses; and allow us to do the jobs we have done for so many years, and not limit the valuable service we provide to just a few national firms within your state.

We appreciate your consideration and support of this important bill, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Assemblymember Flanagan:
We have heard a lot on this, and I hope it has been an extensive amount of information that helps you get a clear picture on where we are going with Assembly Bill 430. To address the sections of the bill, there are only a couple of sections to point out. Section 1 removes payroll processing services from the definition of money transmission. Section 2 exempts a person engaged solely in payroll processing services from the provisions governing money transmission. Thereby, a person is not required to obtain a license from the commissioner of the Division of Financial Institutions, Department of Business and Industry to engage in payroll processing services. Lastly, section 3 repeals provisions setting forth certain duties of persons engaged in providing payroll processing services. We will stand for questions if you have any.

Chair Marzola:
Committee members, are there any questions?

Assemblymember Miller:
I really appreciate having the visit and explanation of this bill beforehand. I understand this is to undo some unintended consequences from the prior session. Now that I am reading the bill language, I still have some concerns. My understanding of who should not be captured or included would be those human resources groups or services that were captured because it included basically anyone transmitting money.

Maybe you or Legal can clarify this for me. When I go through the bill, section 1 talks about receiving money; section 2 talks about similar transfers of money, money transmission for goods and services, entities that have directly incurred, securities, brokers, dealers under federal law. I identified those terms because it is my understanding that with human resources, there are deductions in transmission of money. Often those occur maybe for charitable donations, certain additional insurances an individual may pay for, and even garnished wages. Knowing it says securities and broker-dealers, knowing it says goods and services, which insurance could also fall under, I just want to make sure we do not have another unintended consequence that somehow, because of the transmission of money, is occurring for those types of activities that they can still be carved out as intended by this bill.

Michael Hillerby:
All deductions that would come as a part of that payroll are covered by that. Regardless of what it was, if you had elected to do nonprofit, if there was a garnishment, if you had

supplemental insurance, health insurance, life insurance, things various firms might offer are all a part of that payroll transaction. Hopefully what Robin went through, with some of the other oversight and regulation, explains why we are asking to be added to that long list of functions and entities in section 2 that are exempted from the provision of the law because there is otherwise regulation. That would separate payroll providers, as they have always been, from traditional companies handling cash to send it to a family member; stored value cards; we are seeing a lot of changes and new entrants in the financial technology world, and cryptocurrency and other kinds of things. Those companies that are taking cash or offering stored value cards or other things directly to a consumer would still be covered. If you are a payroll processing company doing anything else, you would still need to be licensed, but if you are solely in the business of providing payroll service, you would not be licensed under the Model Act.

Chair Marzola:
Committee members, any additional questions? [There were none.] Mr. Hillerby, in your presentation did you state there are other states that have such legislation that does not include the payroll? We just happen to be the one that did last session.

Michael Hillerby:
According to the latest information from the Conference of State Banking Supervisors, 27 states have passed some version or all of the Model Act that started in 2022. Nevada passed the Model Act in its entirety in 2023. The payroll industry was not aware they were being considered for inclusion as larger parts of the industry worked on the Model Act. Once they found that out, they went back to the Conference of State Banking Supervisors and were told they were free to go back and seek to amend themselves out of the state laws. So that has happened in one of two ways: they have either worked with states in the process of adopting the Model Act and payroll was excluded or, as we are doing here in Nevada, seeking to amend it out after the passage of the act. Approximately half the states have done one version of that or another. There are, as I said, five states we are aware of so far that the legislation is progressing in this year.

Chair Marzola:
I do not see any additional questions. We will move to testimony in support of Assembly Bill 430. Is there anyone wishing to testify in support?

Nick Schneider, Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:
We are here in support today of A.B. 430 and believe this will benefit small business in the payroll processing industry. This specific subsector of the broader money transmission industry already has a large number of checks and balances. We believe the implementation of this exemption would not lead to any negative externalities from these businesses or to the many small businesses that rely on payroll processing services to comply with the payroll tax or other laws. We ask for your support of this bill.

Tom Clark, representing Nevada Society of Certified Public Accountants:
Hopefully, you can see a letter from Anna Durst, who is the CEO of the Nevada Society in support of this particular piece of legislation [Exhibit O]. I will not hit on all of the testimony that has already been provided—the experts did that for us. I simply say on behalf of Nevada Society of CPAs, we are very much in support.

Chair Marzola:
Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition. Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.]

[Exhibit P was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

We will move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Assemblymember, would you like to give any final remarks?

Assemblymember Flanagan:
I want to thank the Committee for hearing the bill and, on the record, thank the cosponsors: Assemblymembers Brown-May, D'Silva, and Nguyen. We thank you for your time and consideration of this bill.

Chair Marzola:
I will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 430.

[The Committee recessed at 3:11 p.m. and reconvened at 3:12 p.m.]

[Assemblymember Jauregui assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Jauregui:
I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 142.

Assembly Bill 142: Revises provisions relating to industrial insurance. (BDR 53-876)

Assemblymember Elaine H. Marzola, Assembly District No. 21:
Today I will be presenting Assembly Bill 142, which revises provisions relating to industrial insurance. I have here with me my copresenter, Rick McCann, to present this measure. I will briefly set the stage and provide a little bit of an overview and then I will turn things over to Mr. McCann.

First responders are regularly exposed to life-threatening situations, traumatic events in high-stress environments. The nature of their jobs, which often involve witnessing a violent event and making life-and-death decisions, places a significant burden on them. For example, a law enforcement officer is routinely exposed to scenes of violence, accidents, and critical health emergencies, all of which can take a toll on their mental health. Civilian employees

and law enforcement agencies provide a crucial operational and administrative support, including investigating crime scenes and managing other high-stress responsibilities that expose them to traumatic experiences.

However, under current law, crime scene investigators may not qualify for the same protections as sworn officers despite facing similar psychological and emotional burdens. Assembly Bill 142 seeks to broaden the classification of these first responders, ensuring crime scene investigators (CSI) within law enforcement agencies are eligible for industrial insurance benefits for stress-related claims incurred during their employment. This measure provides equitable coverage and support to all individuals who contribute to public safety, acknowledging the diverse roles that collectively maintain community well-being. Before I pass it to Mr. McCann, I do want to say Assemblymember Jauregui had a bill last session and this is expanding her bill.

Richard P. McCann, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition; and Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees:

I am here today representing the Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers and the Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition, as well as the Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees, Inc. I am here today to help present A.B. 142.

After what you just heard the Assemblymember say, I probably should just say ditto, but I get paid by the word. In the 2023 Legislative Session, Assemblymember Jauregui brought an exceptional bill, it was Assembly Bill 410 of the 82nd Session at that time, that allowed gradual mental stimulus to be considered an injury or disease caused by stress, and permitted it to arise out of and in the course of employment for first responders who were defined as firefighters, police officers, emergency dispatchers, or call takers employed by a law enforcement agency or public safety agency, or emergency medical technicians (EMT) or paramedics employed by a public safety agency. That bill passed unanimously in both houses and was signed by the Governor.

This bill, A.B. 142, merely seeks to add civilian employees of a law enforcement agency whose primary duties involve responding to and investigating crime scenes—crime scene investigators or analysts. By the way, just for the record, I was asked by the committee manager to make sure everybody is working off of Amendment No. 2 [Exhibit Q]. We are just working on Amendment No. 2. You will see it simply indicates that we are going to add a civilian employee of a law enforcement agency, and these are the most important words: "whose primary duties involve responding to and investigating crime scenes." That is what we are dealing with. The rest of it is pretty much conforming in terms of the lettering and things of that nature.

Crime scene investigators see some of the worst things that happen in humanity, including fatal vehicle accidents, child abuse cases, elder abuse cases, animal abuse cases, sexual assaults, victims of shootings, and suicides. All similar to other first responders, but the CSI may work crime scenes for many hours, sometimes days, with the deceased. This time includes attending the autopsies and collecting evidence from the decedent.

I am informed that in calendar year 2024, CSIs of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) responded to 841 dead body calls to include traffic fatalities, homicides, suicides, autopsies, drug overdoses, and suspicious deaths. Each supervisor responded to an average of 37 dead body calls. The average CSI on day shift responded to 64 autopsies, or dead body calls, and the average senior CSI not on day shift responded to 38 of those dead body calls just last year. This does not include the societal mayhem they witness daily for folks who remain living to include photographing their injuries, collecting evidence from hospitals and crime scenes.

The continued exposure to these difficult scenes throughout their careers can have seriously harmful effects on their professional and personal lives. In short, Assembly Bill 410 of the 82nd Session was a great bill in 2023 that protects our first responders with stress-related claims. This bill, A.B. 142, is also a great bill in 2025 that will similarly protect crime scene investigators who are vital in the criminal investigatory process and who experience the same, and oftentimes more, death and destruction than our other first responders.

Respectfully, there are few people in this building—other than police officers, firefighters, and EMTs—who can do what they do, see what they see, hear what they hear, smell what they smell, and touch what they touch. These CSIs are heroes, and they need to be protected as such. For these reasons, we ask that you support A.B. 142.

Assemblymember Marzola:
We are ready for questions.

Vice Chair Jauregui:
Before I go to Assemblymember Yurek for our first question, I just want to say thank you so much for bringing this bill. I agree, A.B. 410 of the 82nd Session was a great bill, but I am happy to see we are able to expand it and you are here presenting this bill. I know from the conversations I had with our first responders during the 2023 Session and describing what they are exposed to, it is repeated exposure to dead bodies, shootings, and assaults. We need to make sure we are taking care of the people who take care of us.

Assemblymember Yurek:
Thank you both for what I believe to be probably one of the most impactful bills I have heard so far this session. Many members know I am a prior law enforcement officer. I have responded to hundreds and hundreds of scenes that would shock the conscience of people who have to deal with those. It was not until recently, through bills like the majority leader's A.B. 410 of the 82nd Session, that we are now seeing industrial insurance start to cover some of these very real issues that our folks who work in law enforcement do.

I can tell you, as a first responder police officer, it was challenging to walk into a lot of those scenes and see what you had to see and what you had to deal with, but it was easy to just focus on task and push through, isolate the scene, and then let the folks in the Criminalistics Bureau come in and do the crime scene investigation. It was not until later in my career, when I became the Criminalistics Bureau commander and had to go back into the scene under that role, that I now recognize how important this bill is. While I had to go in and spend maybe a minute or two to clear the scene and see something horrible, these folks have to go back in for hours and get up close and intimate and personal with horrible sights and smells that I am so glad to see this bill cover now. My question, after saying that long diatribe, is would you consider amendment number 3 and adding me to this bill?

Assemblymember Marzola:
Yes, of course. Thank you for wanting to be part of it, and also for your service.

Vice Chair Jauregui:
Members, any other questions?

Assemblymember Cole:
This one is for civilian employees. Are all of the employees directly already covered, such as county coroner investigators, Metro employees, are they already covered under this or no?

Rick McCann:
No, they are not all covered. What you see here in front of you is the definition of a first responder. If they are a salaried or volunteer firefighter; police officer; emergency dispatcher, or call taker who is employed by a law enforcement agency, which we defined herein; or other public safety agency in the state; now we wish to add, of course, the CSIs. Then in section 1, subsection 8(b)(5) it has an emergency medical technician or a paramedic who is employed by a public safety agency in this state, which further is defined as potentially an emergency medical service. We are limited in those areas. I will not tell you that I have not considered and really would like to see coroners in there, but that has not yet been brought to bear.

Vice Chair Jauregui:
Members, any other questions? [There were none.] We are going to move to testimony in support. We will start in Carson City then to Las Vegas.

John Abel, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association:
I represent the Las Vegas Police Protective Association, which is the Metro officers in Las Vegas, and we obviously support this bill. I want to thank you again, Assemblymember Jauregui, for bringing the bill last session. It has definitely been impactful on many of our officers, as you know.

I thought about stories I would tell because I have been an officer for 18 years. I have been to many of these calls and one that sticks out in my mind—and I will not get too gruesome with you—but I responded to a woman who was pregnant and was killed by her boyfriend. As I

secured the scene, she was lying there on the floor with a knife sticking out of her neck. I am in there for probably 30 minutes or so and the CSI or ID tech is in there the entire time with them. In fact, I asked, Who has to pull the knife out of this poor woman's neck? and it was the CSI tech that had to do it to preserve the evidence. They are now, hopefully, going to be covered under this bill. For that reason, we support.

Vice Chair Jauregui:
Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] We will move to Las Vegas.

Kristin Grammas, Director, Crime Scene Investigations Section, Criminalistics Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:
[Read from written testimony, Exhibit R.] I am here today on behalf of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to testify in support of Assembly Bill 142. I want to discuss something often overlooked, but incredibly important when it comes to the work of crime scene analyst: the impact of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Being exposed to graphic images, death, violence, and human suffering can take a toll on their mental health. They witness unimaginable trauma on a daily basis.

Assembly Bill 142 section 1, subsection 4(a) states "the employee has a mental injury caused by extreme stress due to . . . directly witnessing the death, or aftermath of the death, of a person as a result of a violent event, including, without limitation, a homicide, suicide, or mass casualty incident . . ." In 2024, the CSI Section responded to 841 dead body calls; 200 of those calls were autopsies. Approximately 2,895 hours were spent on 128 homicide calls last year. Crime scene analysts (CSA) also responded to the tragedy of 1 October and the killing spree of University of Nevada, Las Vegas. They also work cases where an officer is killed in the line of duty. Our job is to document the scene and recover the evidence, which includes responding to the autopsy. At autopsy, the CSA recovers the officer's uniform and badge. The badge is given to the family of the officer. These calls are particularly hard because we have lost a member of our own law enforcement family.

The next portion of the bill [section 1, subsection 4(a)(2)] states "an injury, or the aftermath of an injury, that involves grievous bodily harm of a nature that shocks the conscience." Crime scene investigators respond to other tragic scenes, such as child abuse, sexual assault, neglect, shootings, and attempted homicides to name a few. Last year, the CSI Section responded to 8,261 person crime calls, with 838 of them being shooting scenes.

The last thing I would like to address is the exposure to secondary trauma. Exposure to the trauma of others can lead to a secondary trauma, contributing to PTSD. Crime scene analysts are at scenes with the victim's families, oftentimes crying over the bodies of their loved ones. Posttraumatic stress disorder is a reality for many in this profession. While these investigators are trained to handle the technical aspects of their jobs, the emotional burden of witnessing tragic events can be overwhelming. The effects of PTSD are not always visible, but they can deeply affect an investigator's ability to perform their duties and lead to long-term mental health challenges.

Sadly, the stigma surrounding mental health and CSI can prevent individuals from seeking help. This is why this change in A.B. 142 is so important. It is time to recognize PTSD as a valid and severe consequence of work of CSIs. Just as we have extended coverage for law enforcement—

Vice Chair Jauregui:
Thank you so much for your testimony, we are going to have to move on to the next testifier. We appreciate your being here and if you could, please submit your testimony in writing to the committee secretary so we can include it in the meeting exhibits.

Sabrina Steinmetz, Senior Crime Scene Analyst, Crime Scene Investigations Section, Criminalistics Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:
As a CSA, we respond to various crime scenes, including death investigations that range in severity, manner, and age from newborns to geriatric and include animal deaths. These investigations include accidental suicides, homicides, fatal traffic accidents, fire deaths, and officer-involved shootings. We see death in its varying conditions and trauma, from beaten, stabbed, shot, run over, decapitated, eviscerated, burned, decomposed, and with amputated limbs.

Documenting the scene is a long and time-consuming process and includes looking through and touching biological material, like blood, decomposition fluid, and even brain matter to find evidence. This includes mass casualties, like multiple deaths in a car accident or fire scene, or something as large as 1 October. Last year, I personally worked 54 calls involving dead bodies and assisted on multiple others. That is more than one per week if I worked every week of the year. We document officer deaths within our agency and assist other agencies in southern Nevada. This includes the scene and autopsies of those officers. It does not matter if you knew the officer personally or not; those calls are especially challenging and traumatic.

We respond to autopsies at the coroner's office and document the dead bodies. I worked an autopsy of a toddler where I spent the entire day, over 10 hours, photographing the extensive visible injuries on the body and then the extensive internal injuries, including internal bruising and extreme trauma to several organs. Our exposure to these events is for an extended period of time. Often, we clear from a call only to immediately respond to another event. After we clear the scene, we have to handle the items of evidence, recall the images and notes to complete our work product. Then, again recall the information and photographs when we are preparing for court testimony. Weeks, months, and even years later, we repeatedly expose ourselves to these traumatic images and reports in order to do our jobs properly and thoroughly.

I love what I do as a CSA. I am proud and honored to work for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) and serve our community, but the job does not come without its physical, mental, and emotional challenges and sacrifices. I strongly urge the Committee to support Assembly Bill 142.

Samantha Halm, Crime Scene Analyst, Crime Scene Investigations Section, Criminalistics Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:
Why did I choose this career? I was a victim of a sexual assault when I was a child. The suspect lived a long, free life at his residence blocks away from me. There was insufficient evidence to convict him, and I decided to be part of the solution and be the person to get evidence to put people like that away.

I have been a crime scene analyst for 10 years and I can tell you some horrific things, but words can never truly describe how it feels to hold a 5-year-old boy with new and old injuries throughout his body, and have to wait for him to unthaw to conduct a proper autopsy; or to work the death of a patrol officer and see her with a self-inflicted gunshot wound to her head just weeks after working a scene with her; or to work 1 October and be paired with a coroner going body to body, and then witness the victim's family cry and pray over his corpse; or dig through blood-soaked hair and brain matter of the victims, trying to find the bullet holes that killed them.

Two minutes will never be sufficient time to convey how much suffering and trauma we are exposed to day in and day out. Perhaps years would not be either. I worked hundreds, if not thousands, of suicides and it terrifies me that I relate more and more to them throughout my career. I realized I needed help, and I sought it, and I was put in an intensive therapy outpatient program. When asked what I wanted out of the program, it came down to one word: hope. Being knee-deep in the worst of humanity and society does a number on mental health. Today, I am hoping you see that we need this. We need you to do what I had once done and become part of the solution.

Vice Chair Jauregui:
Thank you for your testimony and thank you for sharing your story. I know it is difficult to have to relive those experiences, but what you are doing matters.

Glezzelle Tapay, Senior Crime Scene Analyst, Crime Scene Investigations Section, Criminalistics Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:
I have been working in CSI for over nine years. I believe that this job affects a person beyond some people's control due to exposure of the horrific calls over time. I personally have a dog, and I believe that the dog is my family. I have gone to many calls where I have documented mutilated, abused, and dead dogs. I have had to photograph an innocent baby lying in a nursing pillow on the floor with a gunshot wound between its eyes. The baby had the burnt muzzle imprint and stippling from the gun that was pressed to its face. I have documented a 13-year-old who thought the only answer was suicide by hanging himself from the second story railing, only for his seven-year-old brother to find him later.

I have been affected so dramatically by this career that the majority of my thoughts are now linked to the crime scene. I look at my boyfriend's work boots, and I think that the same color and same style of the boots trooper Micah May wore when he got hit by a car and driven partially down the I-15. If my friend gets a bloody nose, the blood I see is from the helmet of officer Shay Mikalonis during the 2020 riots when he was shot in the head. I see the same

dark red coagulated blood and brain matter when I responded to a suicide in the winter. It was so cold that his blood was steaming, and it actually warmed my fingers. This is someone's son, someone's brother, someone's father, and now I am scavenging through what was once an intact brain, now a puddle on the ground.

I am passionate about this job and most of all, I am passionate about protecting the well-being of those affected by the part of the job that no one talks about or sees. I am here today to be the voice for them so they do not have to visit their traumas alone. No matter how strong someone is, it is inevitable to avoid at least one call they can never erase from their minds; and one call is all it takes. Although I wish I had more time to explain the totality of the detrimental effects of this job, I would like to thank you for your time, and I greatly appreciate the opportunity to be here. Your support means a lot to myself and to the CSI Section.

Vice Chair Jauregui:
Thank you for being here and thank you for sharing your story. Again, what you are doing matters, sharing your personal stories matter. Thank you for your strength in being here.

Tabatha Paine, Crime Scene Analyst Supervisor, Crime Scene Investigations Section, Criminalistics Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:
When I came into this position in 2014, I could be described as bubbly, vivacious, sweet, and positive. I was always the first person to volunteer to participate in events on my days off and always eager to talk about my career. We call that a "blue flame." It has now been 11 years. In those 11 years, I have seen brutal and savage homicide scenes; horrific child abuse and neglect that often results in death; horrendous, fatal traffic accidents with victims mangled and torn apart. I have seen grieving mothers, fathers, and partners who have just lost the most important people to suicide. I have seen evil and even looked it in the eyes. I have seen things that most people could not imagine in their worst nightmares. I have seen my hometown now become a graveyard of sights, sounds, smells, and experiences that live inside of me. I have lost colleagues to substance abuse and to suicide. All things that I will never forget.

What impact does that have on a person? Here are a few things, and this just scratches the surface. Those closest to me have told me that I have changed; that I am no longer the sweet person I used to be, that I am not as outgoing and that my spark is gone. I now have anxiety, something I never experienced prior to having this career. Anxiety that makes me feel like I want to crawl out of my own skin. It is crippling and now it is a part of me for always.

I was faced with a huge personal loss in 2023—I lost my father. At the very moment I saw him flatline, it was clear to me that something inside of me had been irreversibly altered. As I was facing such a huge loss before my eyes, it was like my brain was a computer with a virus. Inside my mind, I was trying to block it out, but what I was seeing and feeling continued to replay on a vicious cycle over and over again while my learned

compartmentalization continued to fight and fail. As rewarding as my career is, it is also completely altering my brain chemistry. To close, I strongly urge the Committee to support Assembly Bill 142.

Carla Scott, President, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees:
We represent over 1,500 full-time civilian employees of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. You have just heard testimony from several of my union members who are the subject matter experts in their field. These first responders play a vital role in the mission of LVMPD and throughout the southern Nevada valley, acting as first responders in the field of collecting and analyzing critical pieces of evidence of crime scenes. They respond to every type of call from fatal traffic accidents, child abuse, homicides, burglaries, and everything in between. They see the aftermath of the horrific crime scenes and accidents. The evidence they collect puts together critical puzzle pieces for victims. The conditions they work in are often harsh as they are exposed to the elements and have to be constantly alert of their surroundings. As a licensed master social worker in the state of Nevada, knowing the daily grind that these crime scene investigators do, takes a toll on what they witness. As a community and legislators, I strongly urge you to support Assembly Bill 142.

Bobbie West, Vice President and Treasurer, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees:
The work crime scene investigators do is exciting for many who play the role while watching from their living room couch, but our employees are not robots. They are humans with empathy and compassion yet have the ability to compartmentalize in order to complete the daily tasks that are required of them and still function in their personal lives. However, for some, weeks turn into years as they are flooded with images and reminders of those crime scenes. Ultimately, this can take a toll on them physically, mentally, and emotionally. Based on the testimony you have just heard from our union members who are subject matter experts in the field, I strongly urge the Committee to support Assembly Bill 142.

Michelle Kmetz, Secretary, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Civilian Employees:
I strongly urge the Committee to support Assembly Bill 142.

Vice Chair Jauregui:
Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of A.B. 142? [There was no one.] Before we move on to opposition, I want to thank everyone who came to testify in support to share their personal stories. I know how difficult it is, but it is courageous of you to be here and know that your collective voices are important and are going to make a difference.

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] At this time, I would like to call Assemblymember Marzola back for closing statements.

Assemblymember Marzola:
I just want to quickly thank the Committee for hearing this bill today. It is such important legislation. I want to give thanks for everyone who supported this bill and was able to come and testify in front of people they do not know and tell such deep-rooted pain they have been feeling. I will let it stand there. Their voices are a lot more important than mine. They live this day in, day out. I just want to say thank you for the support and thank you to the Committee.

Vice Chair Jauregui:
I will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 142. The Committee will stand in recess.

[The Committee recessed at 3:42 p.m. and reconvened at 3:43 p.m.]

[Assemblymember Marzola reassumed the Chair.]

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Chair Marzola:
The Committee will come back to order. I will now open up for public comment. Is there anyone wishing to provide public comment? [There was no one.] Committee members, are there any comments before I adjourn? [There were none.] This will conclude our meeting for today. Meeting is adjourned [at 3:43 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Cynthia Ihejirika
Recording Secretary

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Nikki Peterson
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Elaine H. Marzola Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 12	C	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work session document
A.B. 21	D	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work session document
A.B. 38	E	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work session document
A.B. 215	F	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work session document
A.B. 231	G	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work session document
A.B. 305	H	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work session document
A.B. 371	I	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work session document
A.B. 413	J	Marjorie Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work session document
A.B. 375	K	Assemblymember Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9	Proposed amendment by Nevada Restaurant Association
A.B. 375	L	Assemblymember Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9	PowerPoint presentation titled "AB375 Alcohol To-Go"
A.B. 375	M	Xabier Irujo, on behalf of the Center for Basque Studies, University of Nevada, Reno	Document titled "Picon Punch"
A.B. 375	N	Gino Ferraro, Owner, Ferraro's Ristorante, Las Vegas, Nevada; John Iannucci, Chief Executive Officer, Mas Mex Restaurant Group; Kelly Poulsen, Senior Vice President, Government Relations, Responsibility.org	Letters in support

A.B. 430	O	Anna Durst, Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Society of Certified Public Accountants	Letter in support
A.B. 430	P	Aviva Gordon, Chair, Legislative Committee, Henderson Chamber of Commerce; and Emily Osterberg, Director of Government Affairs, Henderson Chamber of Commerce	Letter in opposition
A.B. 142	Q	Richard P. McCann, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; and Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition	Proposed amendment
A.B. 142	R	Kristin Grammas, Director, Crime Scene Investigations Section, Criminalistics Bureau, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department	Written testimony