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

Eighty-Third Session
April 28, 2025

The Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Elaine H. Marzola at 1:30 p.m. on Monday, April 28, 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:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mary Tran, Deputy General Counsel, Foley Family Wines and Spirits
Joseph O'Sullivan, Master Distiller, Minden Mill Distilling
Leif Reid, representing Minden Mill Distilling
Wiz Rouzard, Deputy State Director, Americans for Prosperity
Matt Robinson, representing Frey Ranch Distillery
Christopher Sewell, Director, Administration Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation
Troy Jordan, Deputy Director, Administration Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation
David Schmidt, Chief Economist, Research and Analysis Bureau, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation
Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Brett Scolari, representing Reno-Sparks Indian Colony
Angie Wilson, Director, Reno-Sparks Tribal Health Center
Alex Tanchek, representing Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; and Duck Valley Shoshone-Paiute Tribe
Jill Douglass, Private Citizen

Chair Marzola:
[Roll was called and Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] Today we will hear three bills, Senate Bill 11, Senate Bill 97 (1st Reprint), and Senate Bill 439 (1st Reprint). I will not be taking those in order. I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 439 (1st Reprint), which revises provisions relating to alcoholic beverages.

Senate Bill 439 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to alcoholic beverages. (BDR 52-1108)

Mary Tran, Deputy General Counsel, Foley Family Wines and Spirits:
To my left is our outside counsel, Mr. Leif Reid of Womble Bond Dickinson. To my right is Mr. Joseph O'Sullivan, our master distiller at Minden Mill Distilling. First, I would like to thank this Committee for giving us the opportunity to present Senate Bill 439 (1st Reprint). I will provide some background information on the purpose of this bill. Mr. O'Sullivan will provide information on Minden Mill's efforts to further the distillery's recognition as an estate distillery, and Mr. Reid will discuss the specific provisions of S.B. 439 (R1).

In 1996, Foley Family Wines and Spirits was founded by Bill and Carol Foley, both Nevada residents. We produce a portfolio of highly acclaimed wines and spirits from various estates in California, Oregon, Washington, and New Zealand. We have also expanded into the spirits business. We are extremely proud to operate Minden Mill Distilling, our estate distillery, located in the historic mill buildings on Highway 395 in Minden, Nevada. The facility has state-of-the-art stills and rickhouses that are climate-controlled and sent to specific locations in Kentucky and Scotland. Our grains are grown three miles away, and the water we use is from an aquifer fed by Sierra Nevada snowmelts. Minden Mill oversees every step of the grain-to-glass process, and no part of our distilling process is outsourced.

Building spirits brands can take up to five years to gain traction in the industry. Senate Bill 439 (1st Reprint) would authorize us to store and bottle third-party bulk spirits. This would help us earn additional revenue to maintain our estate distillery and make the best use of our facility. We have the systems in place to ensure third-party spirits are properly and strictly segregated and to ensure there is no crossover into our estate-distilled products, of which we take great pride in. This bill would also make clear an estate distillery may sell at retail other spirits not manufactured at the distillery as long as it obtains local licensing. As a new business, we would appreciate the ability to maximize the capabilities of our facility and earn additional revenue without diminishing the prestige of having one of the few true estate distilleries in America. I will now hand it over to Mr. O'Sullivan to provide more information.

Joseph O'Sullivan, Master Distiller, Minden Mill Distilling:
I want to thank you for the opportunity to represent the mission at the heart of Minden Mill and why the bill we are seeking poses no threat to the integrity of our estate distilling license. Just like distillers everywhere, we take our brand very seriously. We know representing the community, as much as representing the whiskey we age, is best for all of us. For the past 20 years, I have worked alongside agriculture and know how important it is for products to be made locally because of the pride that manifests, which is why the estate distilling term must be a signifier of quality above all, and for that there must be trust. In the interest of exactly that, this past winter we became members of the University of Kentucky's Estate Whiskey Alliance, a science-focused organization both researching and promoting estate whiskey. We joined because we are serious about our craft and the value it gives to a community.

This organization requires full transparency, including a grain-to-glass pathway where the entire history of a bottle can be seen and supported. Further, it is our policy at Minden Mill that all non-estate spirits are segregated and recorded for similar tracing and transparency. Barrels brought into the rickhouse would similarly be isolated and we maintain a separate labeling system for visual distinction. In closing, I want to assure you the wall between estate and non-estate products will be upheld as professionals and believers in what the estate designation represents. To restate the benefits, this bill amendment is a financial opportunity that will only shorten the path to making Minden and the Carson Valley synonymous with world-class whiskey. I will now hand it over to my colleague, Mr. Reid, to discuss the provisions of this bill.

Leif Reid, representing Minden Mill Distilling:
The changes proposed in this bill are pretty discrete. I will describe them briefly. Section 1 has two principal changes. The first is that craft distilleries would be permitted, using the same statutory language wineries are currently allowed, to sell other types of beer, liquor, or wine as long as it is appropriately licensed in the jurisdiction where the estate distillery is. The other change is what was just described and allows the language would permit an estate distillery to receive neutral or distilled spirits for storage as long as they are marked and completely segregated from the operations of the estate distillery. That is it.

Chair Marzola:
Committee members, are there any questions?

Assemblymember Cole:
Why the need for storing the neutral or distilled spirits received from elsewhere? I am not a distiller and do not understand the difference. Can you explain why we need that?

Joseph O'Sullivan:
The need to store or to bottle allows us to grow the brand. It takes some time for something like whiskey, vodka, whatever we are producing, to generate revenue. To have a distillery you require—it is not like a brewery where you can have a community support it, but because the cost per bottle is more, because the time it takes for these spirits to mature, you are looking at multiple years of patience before you can start to really own a region or a nation or even international distribution. This is purely for us to allow for revenue to be generated by using the equipment we already have, such as the rickhouse and the bottling line, while we go to build the brand with the eventual goal to not have to take third-party work at all, but to be able to focus on our stuff. In short, we have made the investment for bottling lines. It would be nice to use it even if it is not for our products for the time being. But the distinction between estate distilled, which is products that we produce ourselves here, and what we may bring in for just work, would be very clear both at the facility and all documented along the line.

Chair Marzola:
Committee members, any additional questions? I do not see any. I do have a clarifying question. The distillery would be able to sell, for example, beer, liquor, and wine, correct? For example, if I go to the distillery and I do not drink whiskey, and I am with a bunch of friends, but I want wine, that gives you the ability to sell me a glass or a bottle. Correct?

Leif Reid:
Yes, Madam Chair. Just by way of example, the answer to that is yes. Minden Mill is owned by the Foley Family Wines. They have other products which, under existing law, they could not offer you, and this is to allow them to be able to sell those other brands you might be interested in if you were not wanting the distilled spirits at that time.

Chair Marzola:
Committee members, last chance. I do not see any questions. I will begin with testimony in support of S.B. 439 (R1). Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] There is no one in Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the line?

Wiz Rouzard, Deputy State Director, Americans for Prosperity:
We appreciate the presentation of the bill sponsor, and we support this bill wholeheartedly. We believe small businesses, whether it is a distillery or any small business, should have the opportunity to engage in an innovative way to not only draw more customers but provide more goods and services to the marketplace, and given we are an organization that believes in free market principles, we support this bill 1,000 percent and hope the members of the Committee can do so as well.

Chair Marzola:
Is there anyone else on the line? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition to S.B. 439 (R1). Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] I do not see anyone in Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] We will move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral?

Matt Robinson, representing Frey Ranch Distillery:
We are in neutral on the bill simply because we believe the expanded abilities contemplated in this legislation should be applied to all distilleries, including craft distilleries, throughout the state.

Chair Marzola:
Is there anyone else wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] Are there any closing remarks? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on S.B. 439 (R1). I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 11, which revises provisions relating to the payment of extended unemployment benefits. You may begin when you are ready.

Senate Bill 11: Revises provisions relating to the payment of extended unemployment benefits. (BDR 53-306)

Christopher Sewell, Director, Administrative Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation:
Senate Bill 11 is a fairly simple bill and the genesis of it is federal sequestration. We are wanting to change how that is applied in the state of Nevada and how that is applied with claimant benefits. There are a lot of numbers and a lot of legalese I do not have. I am one who always says, Hire the best people in the world. I have two of the best in the world, and I will turn it over to them, my Deputy Director, Troy Jordan, and our state's Chief Economist, David Schmidt.

Before I do, I know a couple of you know I had some issues a few weeks ago; I had to have surgery and I am doing fine. I will recommend that every gentleman in the hearing room and every gentleman online does an annual PSA [prostate-specific antigen] test. They are extremely important. That is my ten-second Health and Human Services Subcommittee thing. But I am doing fine, and I do thank everyone for all the well wishes. I will turn it over to my deputy director.

Troy Jordan, Deputy Director, Administrative Division, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation:
I will turn it over to Dave Schmidt to present the bill because he is the subject matter expert.

David Schmidt, Chief Economist, Research and Analysis Bureau, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation:
As the Director said, Senate Bill 11 has to do with sequestration. There are a lot of different programs that come up. This is a piece of a lot of different programs. I will try to make sure to walk you through all of the different acronyms. Essentially, this is to ensure when the state-extended benefits program is active, it is not imposing any additional costs on the state [Exhibit C]. I was looking at slide 3 of the presentation. I think there are four things you need to know, four different programs related to unemployment benefits to help make clear what this bill is affecting. There is the regular Unemployment Insurance (UI) Program. This is always active. It is the program everyone is familiar with. It provides up to 26 weeks of benefits. It is funded by the State Trust Fund. It is always there if someone loses a job through no fault of their own.

Everything else is only sometimes there. The Extended Benefit (EB) Program is a permanent part of state law, but it is conditional on particular triggers related to the level of benefits being paid to the state's unemployment rate. It only kicks on in recessions. It has kicked on in every recession largely because of action by Congress. There are other programs. There is also the Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC) Program, which is something that has been created by Congress historically in every recession, but it is not a permanent part of law anywhere. Typically, when there is a recession, Congress says people need more weeks of benefits, so they will stand up this program modeled on the many which have come before it to provide some additional weeks of benefits.

And finally, there is the Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA) Program. This was the unemployment program that provided services for gig workers. This was a new thing that came up in 2020; it had not previously been done before. But if you think of unemployment benefits, you are probably thinking of one of those four programs. This bill only affects the EB Program. In terms of who gets paid what and when, the regular unemployment program flows into the EUC Program, which then flows into the EB Program. This is the last payable tier of benefits following in that chain of regular unemployment benefits. The PUA Program is completely unrelated to this. I really only bring it up to say this is not that, to make sure it is clear in your minds.

The Extended Benefit Program, as it functions in law, is designed as a 50/50 split between the state and the feds in terms of the cost of paying for these benefits, recognizing states in a recession face additional burdens, and to incentivize them to have this program in place as a permanent part of law, half the cost is paid by the state, half the cost is paid by the feds. But in practice, in every recession going back to 2001, the feds have also passed—in addition to creating this EUC program—something that says we know it is 50/50 but we are going to pick up the state share. This has typically been the case in every recession.

Why does that 50/50 share matter? When we look at what happens here—we can go to the next slide. Sequestration happens because of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and essentially in every period in which this has been in place, it sequesters or it reduces federal funding for certain permanent federal programs. This is where that 50/50 share matters. We will hear a sequestration. Everything is getting reduced by 5.7 percent. But the actual impact to the Extended Benefit Program only affects that permanent 50 percent share of the federal costs, so it really becomes a 2.5ish percent, 2.35 percent in the most recent recession.

This is a permanent program that does get affected by sequestration. For example, if you have someone who is receiving a $500 weekly benefit under the Extended Benefit Program, the feds say, Oh, we will give you 100 percent of the cost except we are not going to give you 100 percent, we are going to give you 97.5 percent. Instead of $500 to support that $500 payment, we are going to give you $488.50. The purpose of this bill, and we can look at the next slide, is essentially to avoid surprises with the financing. Because the weekly benefit amount people can receive is established in law, we cannot say we are only going to give you the $488.50 the feds are paying; that $500 is established in law. Unless we have a change to the law, states are on the hook to come up with the difference. This essentially provides that mechanism, using language provided by the Department of Labor as sort of model legislation, to allow states to ensure the benefits going out the door match the funds available to pay for those benefits and not to put additional costs on the state. That is what you will see on slide 6. I would say this is largely to avoid surprises in the future.

Following the Great Recession, it was difficult programmatically to try to adopt ways of reducing these benefits, so there ended up being a special program which drastically reduced a couple of weeks, for the people who happened to be on the program at this time, by making sure this is established up front and as a permanent part of the law. It keeps having a big surprise from showing up at the back end for people. With that, we would be happy to take any questions.

Chair Marzola:
Committee members, are there any questions? [There were none.] Thank you for your presentation today. We will move to testimony in support of S.B. 11. Is there anyone here in Carson City wishing to testify in support?

Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:
The Vegas Chamber is in support S.B. 11. We appreciate the work that has been done by DETR [Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation]. As you heard, this protects the solvency of the trust fund, especially if we move into a recession and, therefore, we are in support.

Chair Marzola:
Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] There is no one in Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition to S.B. 11. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] There is still no one in Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] We will move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] Are there any final remarks? [There were none.]

I will now close the hearing on Senate Bill 11. I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 97 (1st Reprint), which makes revisions to the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange.

Senate Bill 97 (1st Reprint): Makes revisions to the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange. (BDR 57-346)

Brett Scolari, representing Reno-Sparks Indian Colony:
I am here today proudly representing the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony. With me today is Daryl Gardipe, Tribal Chairman of the Colony, and Angie Wilson, who is the RSTHC [Reno-Sparks Tribal Health Center] Director. First, we sincerely appreciate the opportunity to present Senate Bill 97 (1st Reprint). Today we would also like to thank Senator Doñate for allowing us to work on S.B. 97 (R1) to focus on a change to the makeup of the Board of Directors of the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange (SSHIX). Lastly, we would like to thank the members of the Interim Health and Human Services Committee who worked so hard on tribal issues that were important to tribes in our state and to the state of Nevada.

Senate Bill 97 (1st Reprint) is really straightforward. It amends *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 695I.300 to require one of the five Governor appointments to the SSHIX Board be a member of a Nevada tribe with experience in tribal health administration in the state of Nevada. We believe this change is critical for the state, the Exchange, and the tribal community to work together and collaborate to deliver the best possible health care to tribal members of this state. I would love to turn it over to Ms. Wilson and she can explain a little bit more as to why this change is so important.

Angie Wilson, Director, Reno-Sparks Tribal Health Center:
There is a special trust responsibility and legal obligations when it comes to health care for American Indians and Alaska Natives. The responsibility is really with the federal government. I want to explain, treaties between the United States and tribal nations provide the legal foundation of the federal government's obligation to provide health care for American Indians and Alaska Natives, and through this process to also include the health care for tribal nations

across the board. The modern authorization for this provision of health care services to our people is known as the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and the primary authorization to pay for such federal services for the general welfare remains as the Snyder Act. Congress has also passed additional statutes directing the Indian Health Services to provide health care to our people, and based on this body of law, that trust responsibility is identified as follows:

> The trust relationship establishes a responsibility for a variety of services and benefits to Indian people, including health care. This relationship has been defined in case law and statutes as a political relationship. Treaties between the United States government and our Indian Tribes frequently call for the provision of medical services, the services of physicians or the provisions of hospitals for the care of Indian people.

I wanted to mention that because it really comes down to setting the base on how we got to the provisions I will be talking about when it comes to the Affordable Care Act. When the Affordable Care Act was implemented, it also included the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. What that did was provide a pathway so our tribes would be able to sponsor health care premiums for our Indian people through the federal exchange and/or through the state-based exchanges.

I want to talk a moment about what some of those provisions are. Like I said, the law does allow for our tribes to use our funding and/or our revenue, or even tribal funds, to be able to purchase health care premiums for enrolled members of federally recognized tribes. The Affordable Care Act also established Indian-specific, cost-sharing provisions under which American Indians and Alaska Natives who are enrolled members of federally recognized tribes pay no deductibles, coinsurance, or copayments when receiving essential health care benefits. Tribal members can enroll either in a zero or limited cost-sharing plan depending on their income level, and/or that our Indian people who are eligible to receive services through the Indian health services or through our tribal clinics also have the option, when they are referred for care, to have zero cost-sharing whatsoever, as long as they are getting the referral through our clinics.

The other thing the Affordable Care Act allowed is, under Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 156, to require qualified health plan insurers to accept premium and cost-sharing payments for tribal members directly from Indian tribes, tribal organizations, or urban Indian organizations. By default, the monthly premiums for these enrollments are managed on an individual policy basis. Under the CFR, it is further leveraged that the authority is granted to establish terms and conditions which will standardize the aggregated payment of premiums by tribal enrollees under the tribal health clinics.

In addition, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, under section 206, as amended by the Affordable Care Act, stipulates Indian health care providers can bill a qualified health plan issuer for covered services provided to plan enrollees regardless if our tribal clinics are contracted with a QHP [qualified health plan] or not, and regardless of that contracting, we would also be able to bill for such services and those services would be reimbursed to the tribal clinics.

What I do want you to know is the Affordable Care Act (ACA) was enacted a decade ago. It has taken us a decade to get to the point where we can do tribal sponsorship in this state. That should not be the way it rolled out, but it is. We have worked really closely with Nevada Health Link and with the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange to create a pathway for tribal sponsorship for our Indian people so our Nevada tribes can move forward with obtaining or purchasing insurance for the members who come to our clinics. I think the beauty in this work has been involving a really strong partnership we now have with Nevada Health Link and the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange.

But I will be honest. I would not expect any of you who have ever had to obtain services in an unfamiliar system to find it easy to understand. For me, although I come from a family who has veterans, I am not a veteran myself. Trying to understand the VA [U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs] is very difficult when it comes to health care; imagine that. But on the Indian Health Services side, there are provisions in the law that depend on your being an enrolled member of a federally recognized tribe or a descendant of a federally recognized tribe where the law changes. It can be really difficult. Those are things we look at providing in our clinic, and sometimes there can be issues of what income counts and what income does not count under the law when it comes to Indian enrollees.

One of the things I want to mention is what we are looking for is a way to strengthen our partnership in the state, especially when we do not know what the future is going to be. I think at the end of this year, we know the Advanced Premium Tax Credit will be up for discussion in Congress. What will that look like for us? How will that impact Indian people? How will it impact our ability to continue to sustain sponsorship of these plans, and what will change in that effort? One of the things we have been able to look at is how we might be able to strengthen the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange, and that would be to place one of the seats as a tribal seat on the SSHIX Board. The Silver State Health Insurance Exchange, I believe, may have seven individuals. We are looking at having one of the appointees, who would be coming out of the Governor's appointment, to be for a tribal seat specifically to help us address these issues. That helps us be able to provide context to changes or concerns we are looking at in the state.

For example, when we looked at the pathway to create a health exchange sponsorship, a tribal sponsorship in the state, one of the things we ran into was, Well, your individuals would have to get our state certification to be able to enroll anyone because people need to know if they

are going to be upsold a new plan. But for us, we are not upselling anything. We are the ones covering the cost of the plan and, in addition, in the federal law, the ACA does not provide a pathway tribes have to follow. A lot of that was education we have had to do with the Nevada Silver State Health Insurance Exchange. They worked with us to come up with and develop a new tribal enroller certification that fits our needs.

We think we can show there is a benefit in working with the tribes on how we might be able to strengthen this opportunity, and we definitely feel one of those seats, at least, should be for a tribal representative. We do feel it would be beneficial to the state. We have worked closely with the Nevada Health Link who, I will say, under the direction of their Executive Director, Russell Cook—who has been amazing at working with us—they initially drafted the language of this additional seat specifically for the tribes. So, I feel like we have a great partnership. I will just say we are here to look at how to be a good steward, how to be a positive influence and a partner at the table when it comes to issues in the Affordable Care Act that directly impact American Indians and Alaska Natives specifically under the law, and again, because of the Federal Trust responsibility. With that, I will turn it over to you if you have any questions.

Chair Marzola:
Thank you for your presentation and for all the information you just provided to the Committee. And I do agree with you. Having a tribal member on the SSHIX Board is very important, but a voting tribal member. Thank you for all the work you have done on this bill. Committee members, are there any questions? [There were none.] We will move to testimony in support of S.B. 97 (R1). We will start in Carson City.

Alex Tanchek, representing Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; and Duck Valley Shoshone-Paiute Tribe:
We are here in support of the bill.

Chair Marzola:
Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of S.B. 97 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 97 (1st Reprint). Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition?

Jill Douglass, Private Citizen:
I stand in strong opposition to S.B. 97 (R1). [Unintelligible] Nevada families are already struggling under the weight of rising costs, higher taxes, and strained health care system. From what I have researched, it seems like there would be a million dollars of taxpayer money set aside to further study expansion of the public benefits.

Chair Marzola:
Ma'am, I am sorry to interrupt you, but I am not sure if you are opposing the correct bill. We are on S.B. 97 (R1) relating to the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange and adding a—

Jill Douglass:
Yes.

Chair Marzola:
As amended, though.

Jill Douglass:
Ok, thank you for that clarification.

Chair Marzola:
Thank you for being part of the process. I do not see anyone else in Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the phone? [There was no one.] We will move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] I do not see anyone in Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] Would you like to give any closing remarks?

Angie Wilson:
I just want to say thank you to the Assembly for hearing this proposed bill. We appreciate that very much and look forward to the next stage of this bill and look forward to being good partners with the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange.

Chair Marzola:
I will now close the hearing on S.B. 97 (R1).

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

I will now open public comment. Is there anyone here in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the phone wishing to provide public comment? [There was no one.]

Are there any comments, Committee members, before I adjourn? [There were none.] This concludes our meeting for today. Our next meeting will be on Wednesday, April 30, 2025. This meeting is adjourned [at 2:11 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Cynthia Ihejirika
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Elaine H. Marzola, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 11	C	David Schmidt, Chief Economist, Research and Analysis Bureau, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation	PowerPoint presentation titled, "State of Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR)"