

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-Third Session
March 6, 2025**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Venicia Considine at 8 a.m. on Thursday, March 6, 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 Venicia Considine, Chair
Assemblymember Duy Nguyen, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Max E. Carter II
Assemblymember Rich DeLong
Assemblymember Reuben D'Silva
Assemblymember Rebecca Edgeworth
Assemblymember Tanya P. Flanagan
Assemblymember Danielle Gallant
Assemblymember Heather Goulding
Assemblymember Bert K. Gurr
Assemblymember Linda F. Hunt
Assemblymember Jovan A. Jackson
Assemblymember Venise Karris
Assemblymember Heidi Kasama

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Erica Mosca, Assembly District No. 14

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alex Drozdoff, Committee Policy Analyst
Sarah Delap, Committee Counsel

Minutes ID: 387



Judi Bishop, Committee Manager
Karri Hurwitz, Committee Secretary
Mary Whalen, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tick Segerblom, Chair, Clark County Board of Commissioners
Wesley Harper, Director of Government Affairs, City of North Las Vegas
Jessica Glover, Private Citizen, Nevada
Mathilda Miller, Government Relations Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada
Cal Boone, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Donna West, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Rudy Zamora, Advocacy Director, Chicanos Por La Causa
Denise Bolaños Heredia, Associate Director, Return Strong!, Carson City, Nevada
Al Rojas, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Matthew Wilkie, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Luiza Benisano, Campaigns and Community Engagement Manager, Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada
Evelyn Pacheco, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Alexander Avila, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Kelly Crompton, Government Affairs Manager, City of Las Vegas
Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County
John Advent, Deputy Director, Real Property Management, Clark County
Anne Barnett, CEO, Nevada Contractors Association
Warren B. Hardy II, representing Associated Builders and Contractors Nevada; and Urban Consortium
Josh Giusti, Nevada/Energy Division Manager, Sletten Construction Company
Heather Avila, President and CEO, Live Electric Inc.
Tiesha Moore, President, G3 Electrical

Chair Considine:

[Roll was taken. Committee protocols were reviewed.] Today we will hear two bills. First, we will hear Assembly Bill 263, which revises provisions relating to homelessness, and then we will hear Assembly Bill 43, which revises provisions relating to public works. To ensure that we get through everyone fairly and in a timely manner, we will set a 20-minute time limit for each period of support, opposition, and neutral testimony with each speaker having 2 minutes to ensure we allow as many people as possible to testify. Please feel free to say ditto if someone else has already covered your testimony. I will now open the hearing on A.B. 263. To present this measure we have Assemblymember Mosca, please go ahead when you are ready.

Assembly Bill 263: Revises provisions relating to homelessness. (BDR 20-96)

Assemblymember Erica Mosca, Assembly District No. 14:

Thank you so much, Chair and Committee on Government Affairs. I am sorry you have to see me again. Before I start, I will have my copresenter introduce himself.

Tick Segerblom, Chair, Clark County Board of Commissioners:

I am copresenting with Assemblymember Mosca, but mainly just here to let you know why this bill is so important.

Assemblymember Mosca:

Today we will go behind the why of Assembly Bill 263—share more about my district in east Las Vegas. This is actually the bill that I have been working on the longest [[Exhibit C](#)]. I am excited to share the work we have been doing with you here today. I wanted to make sure that Commissioner Segerblom also had time to share his perspective as my district is nested in his district and we have been working together on it as well. The bill review, it is really more of a rewrite through the amendment [[Exhibit D](#)]. I will take time to go over that, do a closing, then, of course, open it up for questions.

As you know, I have three policy pillars that I am working on this session. Assembly Bill 263 really goes under my community support pillar. In some ways I think it could go under my good governance pillar, but to me, it really is helping the community that I represent in the east side. Today we are really talking about unhoused individuals, whom I actually also consider as my constituents and really look at them in an assets-based way. This bill to me both, I hope, supports community members and constituents in my district who have concerns about that as well as the folks who live in my district but may just not be housed. It really is trying to direct the Department of Transportation (NDOT). I know in the original bill it said the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). That was a drafting error. It is NDOT and the county to work together to support the communities who need it the most.

This is a map of my district. Again, I proudly represent east Las Vegas. I did not share this last time, but you know I grew up low-income in a different state. I went to college in Boston. I joined Teach For America, which moved me to east Las Vegas, and my parents lost their jobs in the recession. East Las Vegas in Nevada was a place where I could buy a home as a second-year teacher. I know that is not true anymore and we are all continuing to try to make solutions towards that. That was the first time I had homeownership in my family. My parents lived with me on the east side until I got married.

Nevada gave me a place, as someone who moved around and went to six different schools growing up, that I could call home. That is really why I love Nevada, and I love east Las Vegas. As what was on the slide last time, we do have a lower median-household income. Half of my—more than half of my district—is renter occupied than owner occupied. Again, a vibrant community with diverse small businesses from mochi, from our new Greek place to our new coffee place on Charleston Boulevard and Nellis. There is a lot of great

things there, but there is very little economic development. Even this week—I have Google alerts so I always check what is happening in my district—there was a small business that had all of their copper wire stolen in their air-conditioning and it is a small salon that is owned by small-business family owners, and we were able to donate a little bit towards them so that they could keep their doors open. That is the kind of thing that happens in my district. Again, I want to say to all of those who are listening out there, I do believe that my unhoused constituents are our constituents too.

This bill is about the number one issue that people call me about, email me about, text me about, or talk to me whenever they see me. The first two pictures on the left are at two properties in my district owned by Nevada HAND. Those are affordable housing. The one on the left is a senior residence, the one to the right is a family property. I have done two events there and whenever I do events, I also do town halls to hear from constituents. It was the number one thing they talked about.

In the middle is Ovation Property which is Acapella Senior Living. I had an event for the seniors on Thanksgiving. It was the number one issue they talked about. The fourth picture is an event at the park. I have had an event at every park in my district. Again, it was the issue people talked about. Finally, the picture on the right is at Acapella Duet, which is the second Ovation Property affordable housing in my district. This was in partnership with Commissioner Segerblom, and the town hall was on the unhoused individuals in our district. As I said, I have the Google alerts. This is the number one thing that comes up in east Las Vegas, really both community members being wary about the number of encampments in the district, I think, as well as folks who are wary that we are not helping folks enough who are unhoused.

What can I do? I think about, again, we are the state. I am not the county. I am not the city. We meet every other year. We all know it is not a paid job. What could I do as a state perspective and as a legislator? I am going to show you 30 seconds of this video [[Exhibit E](#)].

That is what we did for a whole year. We took action. We helped and cleaned up. We talked to the unhoused residents to learn more about issues and I learned—and I think we learned. This is a picture with our Chair here [[Exhibit C](#)]. We went on our Homeless Outreach Team (HOT) and a Multi-Agency Outreach Resource Engagement (MORE) team to understand what Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) is doing on the issue and I thought it was very helpful.

These are actual pictures from the last year of what it looks like in my district, the one on the right. I cleaned up all of that because it is the number one thing that my constituents talk to me about. It is a very political statement to make, but I know in places like Summerlin, maybe Damonte Ranch, I do not know, but higher income places do not look like this and that is really what this bill is about.

For the last year and a half, we did over a dozen cleanups with over 20 individuals, and did 2 town halls. I talked about the Acapella Duet, but we also did one at the Maycliff mobile

homes, which is located on East Sahara Avenue and Sandhill Road, which I think has some of the biggest issues. I have a picture later from this week I will show you. I did two Metro ride-alongs because when I did the HOT team ride-along I thought it was really helpful, but I wanted to partner with the Southeast Area Command and do the ride-along in my actual district. We did the ride-along to understand the folks in my district and what they are going through. I toured multiple municipal and county facilities, including the Clark County Navigation Center located in Assembly District 14, which I am so grateful to the County Commission for.

I toured the City of Las Vegas Courtyard Homeless Resource Center twice and I even came up north to see the Nevada Cares Campus because I had heard so much about the work that was going on up here and I wanted to understand that. It was really interesting what came out of so many of these meetings is how much in my district is actually owned by the State. The Nevada Department of Transportation or NDOT actually owns a lot of the right-of-ways in District 14, which I had no clue. I met with and I want to thank them as well for having multiple meetings to talk about this issue. Then, here I want to emphasize I of course met with multiple nonprofits to understand root causes, current gaps, current solutions in southern and northern Nevada, and talk to people with lived experience who I think are the most important folks to talk to when it comes to these issues.

I want to acknowledge to our members and everyone out there, this bill is not solving housing. This bill is not solving mental health. There are so many root causes that I actually think is on us, all of us who are elected to work on. But for me again, thinking about the state as a state legislator, what can I do? I find this is just a very small piece to multiple things that I think will hopefully solve the issue for both our unhoused constituents as well as their constituents in our district.

The very first meeting about this was when I went home two years ago for a weekend and I met with Commissioner Segerblom and we walked the wash. Here I am going to stop and let the Commissioner share his perspective before we move on to the bill review.

Tick Segerblom:

Several of you I know are in my district and represent my members of my district also. Firsthand, you know what we are dealing with. I just want to point out first, this bill is designed to help us when we clean up these areas. Before we go out and do any cleanup, HELP of Southern Nevada goes out, walks the area we are going to clean up, offers services. We bend over backwards to say if you need help, we have help. We have a navigation center, we have housing. The Legislature, to its credit, is funding the Campus for Hope, which hopefully will be in the future of another resource. We are bending over backwards to provide resources, rehabilitation, anything that people need. At the end of the day, these camps just become so large that they become very unsafe and very unsanitary.

What is happening in our district, and this includes the Chair's district, too, U.S. Route 95 which is now Interstate 11, I guess, goes right through—there is a fence on both sides of the freeway which designates the part between the fence and the freeway is NDOT land, and on

the other side of the fence is county land. What happens is when we go to these cleanups, we will go—I tell people we are coming to clean up and frankly a lot of them would say, Oh, thank you, you are here to clean up our camp. They do not object, but what happens is when we go to clean up the area, they will jump over the fence into the NDOT territory and we, being the county, have no jurisdiction there. What we are trying to do is to say if the county is going to come clean up these areas, we would like permission to be able to go on both sides of the fence and clean up the NDOT area also. We are not obligating ourselves to just go out and start cleaning up NDOT property everywhere in the county, but if it is a situation where we, the county, are cleaning up one side of it, we would like to be able to clean up both sides of the fence so that area is clean at least for that day.

It is a very simple concept but this council—I mean Assemblymember Mosca—indicated it is incredibly complicated, and we have learned the hard way that there is just these little pieces that fit through the cracks. Honestly, to the extent that this Committee and this Legislature can address these kinds of issues, it enables us to make better progress which ultimately is to discourage people from living out in the open and get them the help they need, the housing they need, the rehabilitation they need, the mental health treatment, whatever it is they need, that is a very simple concept. What we would like to do is to make sure NDOT and the county can work together in these areas and the county has permission to go work in the NDOT territory when we are cleaning up on our side.

Assemblymember Mosca:

Thank you, Commissioner. Finally, I will go through the bill review, which again is really the amendment [[Exhibit D](#)]. The goal was to emphasize that there are areas in our community in Clark—this is a Clark County bill; in Clark County that needs the most help really should get more help. That really is for the unhoused individuals plus the constituents who live there and to ensure that the county and state work together, as the Commissioner just said.

I will go through the amendment. First, section 1, section 2, subsection (a) [*sic*] what we are trying to say here is that the county does have homeless outreach teams. Those include nonprofits that go out and talk to folks. Now of course there are issues because if you learn about the queue, if you learn about the lack of where people can go, again those are large issues that I hope I can address in the future, but right now it is trying to start at step one. There are homeless outreach teams or unhoused outreach teams. I do not think they come to the areas that need them the most as much as they can. I think that our county is doing the best that they can, but I am hoping that this will emphasize the areas where they are getting the most complaints or see the most issues will get more help. To me that will help the people who are unhoused, because we know it takes multiple touches before somebody wants to go into support, and specifically near schools, parks, and senior housing. Why that is there, that is for my constituents, that I showed you because that is directly from people I talk to.

You know Winterwood Park is in my backyard; we go there every day to walk my dog. It is next to Cyril Wengert Elementary School and an unhoused individual was having an overdose. My husband gave the person cardiopulmonary resuscitation because he is a medical professional. He called the ambulance to make sure that person was okay. There

were multiple families and kids who saw that. That is basically a daily occurrence where I live. Also, the bathrooms are locked; we cannot take our kids to the bathroom. We have to go home, because in our community, that is what it is. I really wanted to address that for our constituents.

We have been working with NDOT and the county for a really long time. It can sound like such a simple solution but having folks—to their credit, both entities have been at the table. We are trying to find a solution but we have not found one yet. I am hoping this bill will help people come together. I know that both groups do not really agree as much with the amendment. This is something that we are still working on, but I hope by having this presentation and showing that, you know, there are folks that—I just happen to be here because I was really good at school. Okay, I have never cried in the Legislature. Sorry.

Chair Considine:

It is okay. Take a breath, take a minute.

Assemblymember Mosca:

I am only a legislator because I happen to be good at school. You know, I could go to Harvard on a scholarship and come back and I think I could have decided to live anywhere that I wanted to live. But I live on the east side because it reminds me of how I grew up and is a place where I feel comfortable with my identity and where I could build a home. My husband is in the U.S. Air Force and we forget that Nellis Air Force Base is also on the east side and it is—sorry. I just really believe that it is a forgotten community.

We have removed section 2, subsection (c) [*sic*] because we did not want more government stuff, we just really wanted them to solve the problem. Finally, I am taking cosponsors, especially for our east siderers. I will stop. Sorry again about that, but you know this is a picture that my husband took on Tuesday. This is about five minutes from where I live. This side of the road is NDOT, the other side is county. If you took three pictures, it would have been along the whole route.

Again, I do not blame the folks who are unhoused. I think we have not done enough in our social safety net to make sure they have somewhere to go, but I do know that our low-income communities are disproportionately taking the brunt of a community issue. I was just hoping to come up with something that would hopefully solve a problem for those who may not have a voice and bring a solution that hopefully we can work together on.

Chair Considine:

Thank you very much and thank you for bringing this bill. Just in my district on the east side of Las Vegas, U.S. 95 went through one of our major neighborhoods. I have the same pictures. At this point I would like to move to questions from the Committee. I will start with Assemblymember Flanagan.

Assemblymember Flanagan:

Thank you, Assemblymember Mosca, for bringing this forward and for your passion about it. I understand because of my government experience, the boundary situation. When you get into code enforcement, there is a responsibility that may lie with the county and then the other area becomes the city. It is the first responder situation in terms of who responds. This may be more of even in your amendment space, any consideration given to involving the other jurisdictions?

I ask because I represent District 7. In my district, in some cases it is trash, it is encampments. I just feel like maybe this is a collective response so that everyone carries some of the weight, especially in the areas where it is a consideration, and I know the City of Las Vegas is at the table with the project that they have downtown. Where is North Las Vegas? Where is Henderson in the areas where they also have problems? While it might not be Summerlin, there are areas of Las Vegas—it is like there are areas in North Las Vegas. I guess my question is, is there a conversation to bring all of the jurisdictions to the table on the encampment issue?

Assemblymember Mosca:

I think that is a great point. I do have a small piece which is the city. We had talked to Councilwoman Diaz about it, but we are still working on the bill. Very happy to have another stakeholder meeting where all the folks are at the table. Thank you for that and I will follow up with you how it goes.

Assemblymember D'Silva:

You know, we are neighbors on the east side. We have a lot in common. Our communities are a family, like brother and sister communities. Firstly, I want to ask if I could be a cosponsor onto this piece of legislation. Secondly, this is also in the same question as Assemblymember Flanagan, asking about having a broader inclusivity with the other municipalities. I know that the City of Las Vegas and the City of North Las Vegas are also faced with a similar sort of issues and this piece of legislation would really allow, I think, for a team effort in dealing with an issue that, again, is a very intimate one. It is also one of the highest priorities that my constituents bring to me in terms of the issue that they want us to tackle here in the Legislature. Again, I want to thank you for bringing this legislation and would like to ask you about, potentially, how you feel about bringing in other municipalities into this bill?

Assemblymember Mosca:

I will definitely add you as a cosponsor. I will maybe even invite you and Assemblymember Flanagan to the meeting if you are interested so we can continue to work on it.

Assemblymember DeLong:

I appreciate your passion on this issue. You have identified this term homeless outreach teams or team. Have you put any thought into what the composition of that is? Does there need to be a definition as far as what that is?

Assemblymember Mosca:

That is a great question. Currently the county has them. I would love for the Commissioner to talk about what currently constitutes the homeless outreach teams.

Tick Segerblom:

We have different teams. We have a lot of nonprofits, primarily HELP of Southern Nevada that has its own social workers and case workers who will go out to these encampments days ahead of time and offer services and let them know that if they are still there in a couple of days, we are going to clean up the camp. But we also have homeless outreach teams that are tied with Metro. We have the MORE team. The different entities, the city and the county have different entities, but we have several different ones.

We could try to put a definition there but I am not sure because of the fluidity of the issue how we could fully describe it. At least we can point out that they are government sponsored. They are paid by the county or the city. You just cannot believe a lot of these homeless outreach teams will go into the tunnels which are under the Strip. The people who work on these nonprofits are really phenomenal. It just breaks your heart when you meet them because they are so committed to doing the right thing. I have to point out again, this is a societal problem. We are having to deal with it but it is really, to my mind, terrible that a society as rich as ours could have people who have fallen through the cracks and are actually forced to live like this.

Assemblymember Edgeworth:

Thank you, Assemblymember Mosca, for your passion. As you and I have discussed before, I personally go out with the HOT team and the MORE team, and I know that there are a lot of people who are working on this problem. Like the RTC has The Arrow shuttle and the Southern Nevada Health District is going out to help encampments. I love all the things that are being done. I think it is unfortunate that people are working kind of in silos. There are a lot of people coming at it from different angles. I like the effort to try to bring us all together to try to solve the problem and I know the east side is kind of far from the Corridor of Hope where most of the resources are located. I appreciate that.

I am sorry that this is not as much of a question, but I will cosign the bill. I would love to do that. I love that you are shining a light on people experiencing homelessness, which I think we all want to fix, but it also greatly affects the community and their ability to use their resources out in the community. It is a complex problem, but I love that you are putting an effort forward to try to fix it. Thank you. Sorry. Not a question.

Chair Considine:

I just wanted to check, Assemblymember Edgeworth. Was your question if you could be added as a cosponsor?

Assemblymember Edgeworth:

My question is, can I be added as a cosponsor?

Assemblymember Mosca:

Yes. Thank you.

Chair Considine:

Our next question is from Assemblymember Kasama.

Assemblymember Kasama:

I grew up in an immigrant community where I was frightened to walk outside our door because of all the gangs that were there. I certainly understand the challenges in some of these communities and what people are going through. My question is section 1 where we have "shall establish homeless outreach teams," Just to be clear, the county is already doing this, correct? This does not put an extra burden on the county, does it?

Assemblymember Mosca:

Yes, they are already doing it. The extra which we are hoping they could do is to just do it more frequently in the areas that have more of the issue and then to work with the state.

Assemblymember Kasama:

Your section 2, subsection (a) [sic] is really what changes what the county is doing. You are trying to put an emphasis on the certain areas. Is that correct?

Assemblymember Mosca:

Yes, exactly.

Assemblymember Kasama:

Great. Then subsection (b) is just making sure that you are tying in with the state?

Assemblymember Mosca:

Yes, and what the proximate jurisdictions, that was important to the county, what that is saying is, like the Commissioner said, we do not expect the county to go clean up everywhere. That is NDOT, but just really where it intersects so folks have more touches and cannot just maybe go across the street instead of getting the outreach or the help.

Assemblymember Jackson:

My question is can I also cosponsor and then—I know cleanups are very important, but I also realize cleanups have an impact on the homeless individuals who may have social security cards, identification, things like that. My question is, have you had direct conversations with the county to ensure that we are not doing more damage with these cleanups and making sure these people could still identify themselves and have their identity?

Assemblymember Mosca:

You can, of course, cosponsor. I appreciate you. That is such an important question. I will start sharing my experience and I will let the Commissioner also share. That is why I think I have so much passion for this is because I went and I talked to so many of the folks. A couple of things that are really interesting when we went and did the cleanups, a lot of the

unhoused folks were so appreciative to get the trash bags. Sometimes when we were not doing the cleanup we would just drop off trash bags. You have probably heard this from the experts, a lot of these encampments do have rules, they have governance that they stand by, which I think is pretty great. When we would go out and talk to folks, we would knock on the door, or it is not a door but the place that stands for a door. You do not just walk into someone's area. There is usually someone in the encampment you are supposed to talk to. We would talk to the person who was kind of in charge and we would let them know. When we, as just individual constituents, would go to cleanups we would not enter someone's space because we knew that was important.

For us it would just be around the area. I would say that it was actually a very great experience talking to folks to understand what were some of the root causes of why they were there and why they were not taking the help; from if places do not take pets, to you cannot stay in the same room as someone who is not your legal partner. If you do not have a marriage certificate, but your partner is outside, you cannot stay in the room together. That is how we learned some of these issues. I would love for the Commissioner to also talk about what they do to ensure folks are not losing their identities and their belongings.

Tick Segerblom:

We have these regularly scheduled cleanups every two weeks or every week, in a lot of these areas. What we will do is have one of these nonprofit entities go out and canvass the encampments, explain that cleanup is going to be in two days, offer services, tell them if they want to move their stuff, that is fine, but if it is still there in two days, then they are likely to lose it. Also, when the cleanup actually happens a lot of them have shopping carts or some kind of transportation. They will be given a chance to pick it all up and put it to the extent that they can carry it with them, take it before we remove it. At the end of the day, after we give them notice and after we give them the opportunity to remove that day, if it is still there we have pickup trucks and dumpsters and things and we will just take that stuff and pick it up and take it to the garbage. We bend over backwards to make sure we do not take anyone's ID or anything critical to them but we just cannot let these encampments continue to grow and grow and that is so we do have—at some point enough is enough and we say if it is still there, we are going to take it.

Chair Considine:

Our next question is from Assemblymember Gurr.

Assemblymember Gurr:

Thank you for the bill; I think it is a great move forward, but I am looking at the fiscal note the county put on it. Can you explain that fiscal note for the record for me?

Assemblymember Mosca:

That fiscal note was prior to the amendment. That is why it is still a work in progress. We are hoping that we can get that removed. We are not sure. I have been working with the county and the state again for a really long time on this. I am hoping that just by having a bill hearing and having a bill, it will help us get to a resolution and hopefully not have that.

Assemblymember Gurr:

Thank you and I, too, would like to cosign.

Tick Segerblom:

If I could just follow up. This fiscal note, they did not talk to me before they put it on there, and the way the bill originally read is we are going to have to clean up all the NDOT property—the county is, you know, whether we are cleaning up our own property too. The goal of this is that when we are cleaning up an area, we can clean up the NDOT property next to us, but we are not assuming that we are going to clean up all the freeways in Clark County except that responsibility. I have told them that we are going to change the bill and they have promised they are going to remove the fiscal note.

Chair Considine:

Are there any more questions from the Committee? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation, Assemblymember Mosca. We will move to testimony. We will begin with testimony in support of A.B. 263 and we will start here in Carson City. Please go ahead when you are ready.

Wesley Harper, Director of Government Affairs, City of North Las Vegas:

We appreciate the bill. We appreciate the sponsor bringing it forward and the efforts and intentions of the county. We are looking forward to joining the conversation to see how the City of North Las Vegas can be a participant.

Jessica Glover, Private Citizen, Nevada:

I approve this bill, A.B. 263. A lot of people know that I speak on a lot of different things. Homelessness is one of the hardest things. Number one because I have experienced it; not once but twice. When you are put into that predicament and you experience it, it is a lot different than going out and talking to people. As a life coach and motivational speaker, I could only lead them to the water. You cannot make them drink it. There are people who are homeless because of their circumstances and then there are people who are homeless because they choose the environment. As a northern Nevada resident, what I noticed most is services that are provided for those who choose to be homeless, when everything is free, they do not have to go out and change their lives. There are also organizations, quote unquote, that consider themselves nonprofits or are looking for federal government funding and those funds are not going to the hands that actually need them. My testimony goes far beyond two minutes. Anyone who would like to discuss more of this, you have my information.

Chair Considine:

Is there anyone else here in Carson City wishing to testify in support of Assembly Bill 263? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of A.B. 263? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line?

Mathilda Miller, Government Relations Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada:

We are here in strong, unwavering support of A.B. 263. I was raised on the east side in Assembly District 12. Today I am choosing to grow my family in Assembly District 18

because this is where my roots are. In my free time my family and I are deeply committed to our community, whether it is volunteering at cleanups with the Assemblymember or assisting our neighbors in need. Because growing up, I was taught the importance of *mālama*, which means to show up for yourself, for others, and for the land because that is the foundation. We are a strong community. Time and time again we have proven that when we show up for each other, we all do better.

This bill is about dignity and it is also about ensuring responsibility. This is about good government, responsible leadership, and making sure that every single member of our community is taken care of. Most importantly, thank you to Assemblymember Mosca for putting forward this legislation and for standing up for the needs of your district and the east side. Thank you for showing our state what it means to be an unwavering champion for our community and for never backing down, especially for those who need it the most. We urge your support. [[Exhibit F](#) was also submitted.]

Cal Boone, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I am testifying in support because I think things like this are long overdue and I am really thankful to Assemblymember Mosca for bringing this forward. I agree with sentiments from the Committee that we should not be working in silos, whether that is state government or county governments. Part of this—why I am in support, too, is because we need to create spaces where we are uncomfortable doing this work. When we are uncomfortable that is how you know change is happening. That is how you know we are working towards change. We do not want to exist in a place of comfort when there are communities, especially the unhoused community, that are going without resources. I would really love to see this be expanded further and applicable to all counties. Recently, the Carson City Board of Supervisors has been discussing the *Johnson v. Grants Pass* ruling last year and how that affects Carson City. With that, resources are being put into removing unhoused camps and pulling away those resources. I think when we look at a bill like this, I think it would be great to expand it further and have it applicable to all counties so that each county has to engage in this amazing outreach work. Again, I am in support of this and thank you to everyone who is providing support.

Donna West, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a resident of east Las Vegas, and I have lived here for 40 years. I am also a constituent of Assembly District 14, and I am extremely proud this morning to be represented by Assemblymember Erica Mosca. I thank her for bringing forward [A.B. 263](#) to better address the needs of the homeless in east Las Vegas. Having lived here for 40 years, I can tell you that we are seeing an unprecedented number of homeless in our neighborhood. Thanks to Assemblymember Mosca, I participated in the neighborhood cleanup efforts. While out collecting trash, many homeless have approached us and even helped us clean up. Some ask for help. They may need a bus ticket to reach a family member in another state that can provide them with housing and assistance. Others are looking for help locally. The need is overwhelming. There is no one cause to homelessness. There is not one solution. It takes a village. The approach proposed by [A.B. 263](#) provides a solid foundation to helping my neighbors and my neighborhood. Please vote yes and pass [A.B. 263](#).

Rudy Zamora, Advocacy Director, Chicanos Por La Causa:

We are here to express our strong support for A.B. 263. I am just going to go ahead and ditto what has been said this morning for the sake of time, but we do want to thank Assemblymember Erica Mosca for bringing this bill forward. Again, we are in strong support of this bill. [[Exhibit G](#) was also submitted.]

Denise Bolaños Heredia, Associate Director, Return Strong!, Carson City, Nevada:

We are in strong support of A.B. 263 and would love to see it expanded to other areas. There is a clear connection between homelessness and incarceration. People leaving prison often face tremendous barriers in securing housing and employment, which makes it harder for them to stay out of the system. This bill takes a step in addressing this by offering proactive support and helps ensure people do not end up incarcerated just because they have no place to sleep. Thank you for your time and thank you to Assemblymember Mosca for bringing this bill and for your authenticity.

Al Rojas, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I live in Assembly District 12 and my Senate District is in conjunction with Assembly District 14. I am very active in our community. I attended many of our First Tuesdays and I work closely with Metro and their community outreach program to control homelessness in our area. We have found that we want to nip this homelessness in the bud before their problems get too big and these home encampments get too large. The problem we are seeing is that they count on public land, our county commissioners do not have enough jurisdiction and do not have enough resources to get these people the help they need. We definitely need more resources. Keeping homeless people off of private property is not much of a problem. But once they go on a public property, our commissioners and our communities are very restricted, and we need more resources. This bill definitely addresses those issues, and I strongly support it, and I will be looking forward to working closely with our officials in addressing the homelessness in public lands.

Matthew Wilkie, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

Just calling in support. I want to thank Assemblymember Mosca for bringing this bill forward and more importantly recognizing that these individuals are your constituents. If home truly means Nevada, these people are not homeless, they just lack a house. Ditto in full support.

Luiza Benisano, Campaigns and Community Engagement Manager, Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada:

I am the campaigns and community engagement manager for Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada, and we support A.B. 263.

Evelyn Pacheco, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am an Army veteran, and I am very much involved in the community with the homeless veterans. I want to thank again and ditto on everyone that came and told their—what is going on with them and in the community. I want to thank Assemblymember Mosca for what she is

doing and what she is presenting and thank her husband for his service. I would really strongly appreciate that we pass A.B. 263.

Alexander Avila, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am calling in today as a constituent of Assembly District 14 in support of A.B. 263. As a longtime resident and growing up my entire life here on the east side, I have seen, of course, the changes that have occurred to our city. Of course this issue, becoming now a more major concern than it was even 20 years ago as I was growing up as a child, is why I feel it is imperative that the county, the city, and of course, here, the Nevada Legislature, take the initiative in ensuring the right measurements are done in order to help the homeless situation that is occurring here in Las Vegas and, of course, throughout our state in general. That is why I am in full support of this bill.

As myself I have been out in the community and I heard also the needs from your constituents of what has been occurring and what they hope to see. We also want to ensure that we are able to go out safely to walk with our families, with our pets and ensure that overall, we have a safe community that is growing. Times are already rough as it is. If you are able to support this bill, get behind it; it will mean the world for us. Thank you and let us do this.

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

Chair Considine:

We will now hear testimony in opposition to A.B. 263. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or the phone lines who wishes to testify in opposition to A.B. 263? [There was no one.] We will now move on to testifying in neutral. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the phone lines who wishes to testify in neutral on A.B. 263?

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

The City of Las Vegas, after listening to the presenters present the bill and the discussion after questions, I think the City of Las Vegas is in a position of neutral. The City of Las Vegas does currently—is responsible for homeless outreach and cleanup residing within the local municipality, and the City of Las Vegas' approach to provide this service is proactive. The ability for the City to reprioritize is critical to the effectiveness of our outreach programs and cleanup programs, as the cleanup activities not only serve and protect the community but reduce the city's liability resulting from the unaddressed hazards.

The City's Neighborhood Services Department has five outreach teams that canvass the entire city jurisdiction to provide support to homeless persons. Our Public Works Department has dozens of staff who work closely with these outreach teams and local law enforcement operating in the city's jurisdiction providing cleanup support within the public right-of-way impacted by homelessness. These teams can rapidly mobilize to address situations arising with increased risk or needs. We hope we can work with the bill sponsor [unintelligible] a local government discussion to ensure that the city can continue to utilize the teams and

efforts that we have been using over the years within our jurisdiction. We just wanted to put on the record, we hope this effort comes with some sort of resource both to NDOT and to the local jurisdictions. As we know, we have spent millions of general fund dollars on these types of efforts.

Chair Considine:

I would like to invite the sponsor back up for any final remarks.

Assemblymember Mosca:

I just want to thank you again for hearing the bill today and being very nice to me. I appreciate it. I want to thank NDOT. I know Mario is down there in Las Vegas as well as Joe is up here. I want to thank County Commissioner Segerblom as well as his team, Javier and [unintelligible] and Joanna up here and really just tell everyone who is interested, our municipalities, we will get together, we will work on it, and I appreciate everybody being on the team to work on it.

Chair Considine:

I will now close the hearing on A.B. 263 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 43, which revises provisions relating to public works. To present this measure we have representatives from Clark County and please go ahead when you are ready.

Assembly Bill 43: Revises provisions relating to public works. (BDR 28-465)

**Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Department of Administrative Services,
Clark County:**

With me at the dais, I want to introduce Mr. John Advent, who is my colleague at the County. He is deputy director of our Clark County Real Property Management (RPM) division and has been working on the pilot program that we are going to talk about today. Then I also have Ann Barnett, who may be familiar to you, executive director of the Nevada Contractors Association, who will also give some comments after we present the bill and walk through about the partnership that we have been able to put together with this program.

I will start here and give you the why. I guess I like how Assemblymember Mosca had said, this is the why for this program. We have been working on a delivery method known as job order contracting since 2021. It was one of the first bills that I did when I joined the county in the 2021 Session. It authorized a pilot program for Clark County to try this delivery method. It was necessary to help us get through some challenges that we had about the time that it took us to deliver maintenance jobs and other things through the time just because of the volume that we have to face. The program that was first proposed in Senate Bill 67 of the 81st Session is now set to expire, which is why we are here before you today to try to make it permanent. I am going to hand it over to Mr. Advent. He can talk about the work of his division, the workload of the division, and then a little bit about what we did in the pilot program and the types of jobs we are able to perform. Then we will walk through the bill and then we will have Ms. Barnett speak. I will hand it over to Mr. Advent.

John Advent, Deputy Director, Real Property Management, Clark County:

I oversee the Design and Construction Division, and as Joanna had mentioned, was helping oversee the pilot program for the job order contracting with the county for the last three years. A little background on RPM and what we do. Design and Construct oversees the planning, design, and construction initiatives for all on-site county projects. These come in as capital improvement projects, maintenance, operational-type projects, and grant projects. We have oversight on approximately 519 buildings and over 120 parks in our jurisdiction. Currently, we have approximately \$500 million on average in rolling annual budget for funded projects. To date today, we have approximately \$691 million in total funding on our purview with 229 active projects we are seeing, from project initiation through design, construction, and close-out.

We have a heavy workload, a diverse range of project types from tenant improvements, new construction, repairs, maintenance, and heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC). You name it, it touches our department. With the job order contracting program that we have worked on, we have seen great success over the last three years. We have utilized the program to complete over 170 job orders to date which constitutes roughly 100 individual projects. We have used that for a diverse range of projects for Parks and Recreation amenities, repairs and replacement, HVAC-necessary equipment, replacements for infrastructure for facilities. For park amenities, that includes things like splash pads, park playgrounds, restrooms. In the previous presentation we heard about Winterwood Park. That restroom in that district was burnt by a vandalism event. We were able to repair and stand that restroom back up under the job order contracting program in a short amount of time. We found that the program helps us deliver projects in a timely fashion, quickly and effectively.

Under our design-bid-build program or delivery method, we are typically 18 to 24 months to get to the street for bid, anywhere from 30 to 40 months to complete the project. Under the job order contracting program, on average we are seeing these jobs delivered in seven months. From start to finish we are delivering a project back to the community in a short amount of time. It allows us to kind of operate as one would expect. If you see a scope and you think that should be a six-month job in your typical period, that is two years in county timelines with government processes. Under the job order contracting program, it allows us to kind of operate more than you would expect, maybe, on the private side.

We were able to successfully hit 50 percent sub participation across our projects, on average 10 percent disadvantaged business utilization with those subs that were part of that. Again, we have just seen quicker turnaround. It allows us to partner directly with the contractor. It allows us to have benefits as an organization where we can plan our workload, we can time out how our work goes. It allows us to communicate with the contractor, communicate with the subcontract community that we see these next 15 projects coming over the next quarter. Then we can work with our contractors to plan that work out and then roll them out so we are not just overloading. It allows us to have an efficient process that works well. On the internal side for our organization, it allows our staff to plan their workload. It frees up resources for those larger design-bid-build projects. It has just taken some of the overload off of our staff

with allowing us to even workload, clear the backlog, keep an efficient timeline with our projects. We are definitely in support and have seen great success under it.

Joanna Jacob:

Mr. Advent has lived this in the last four years. After we walk through the bill if there are technical questions about the program, certainly we are here to answer them. I am going to quickly walk through the bill. I would also like to draw your attention to an amendment [[Exhibit I](#)] which I have put on NELIS [Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System], and there should be before you a very minor amendment, but one that we have worked on with stakeholders on this bill.

I first would like to state that in our experience in working on this kind of legislation that is on construction issues, what you really need to succeed in order to pass legislation is to have a partnership with all of the various—I call it the trifecta—agencies, contractors, and the labor representatives in this building. If you do not have support, I have frequently found having done this for 11 years that it is difficult to pass legislation. What you have before you and as we walk through the bill, I would like you to keep this in mind, was that we negotiated very heavily with all three of those groups in 2021. Really the goal here is to try to continue the structure that we have in place that has worked for us in southern Nevada.

To walk you through quickly: section 2 of the bill is going to authorize the county and certain cities within the county as well as our Water Reclamation District to use job order contracting. These specific jurisdictions, and it is essentially because they are not specifically named, are the cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, and Henderson and Water Reclamation. Water Reclamation has the same board as the County Board [Board of County Commissioners]. That is why they are grouped in because our Board of County Commissioners is also the Board for the Clark County Water Reclamation District. These agencies have the volume that Mr. Advent talked about in trying to maintain and operate facilities and parks, and what that means when those facilities are down, it means that the services, public services, are not available to our constituents. It is reauthorizing those that were authorized during the pilot program to use the pilot program.

Sections 5 through 8 are definitions of terms that you will see us use in the bill. Section 9, I really want to focus on. It essentially describes the job order contracting. These contracts are different from low bid in that they are for a fixed contract period, but they provide for an indefinite amount of types of work and things that may come up and the volume of the work. As Mr. Advent noted, we partner with a general. The way it works is that we will go and bid for general contractors, and we partner with them through the course of the contract period to put together job orders involving job tasks, which is really unit pricing for labor and materials. We will then put the orders out, kind of as they go, so it is not going through our traditional low bid process. Pricing is delivered up front and that is part of the reason why it is quick is that the pricing is agreed to—the unit pricing with an adjustment factor which is really kind of the overhead that the general contractor is going to put on the contract to deliver—kind of carry the load during the contract period.

I do have amendments to this section. Drawing your attention to the amendment, this was actually requested by some of our stakeholders because some of the way that we—our goal really was to try and emphasize that this is supposed to be used for minor construction jobs. This is not meant for new construction. This is not meant for big projects that are going to go out. Those are going to go out through traditional low bid or other design-delivery methods.

I think what we tried to do here was to try and make it a little bit clearer that this is for minor construction of an existing public work. That means something that is built. A park that is already placed, this is not a new park. This is one that we are going in and fixing the splash pads. For those of you who are in southern Nevada, you know that when the splash pads go down, it is a very big issue for our community and for the kids we have in our community that like to go to that facility. This is one thing we have tried to do.

Then in section 9, subsection 4; one of the things that we did in the pilot program, a lot of outreach with the general contractors. This was new. The first thing that was required was for us to do a policy, meaning a policy that the local government will do, that is going to govern the terms of how we are going to operate the program. That policy is the first thing I think that we adopted. One of the Clark County policies was we are going to aim to keep the job orders low, around \$1 million per job order. Our board wanted to get the work out. We put a policy in place that we are going to try and structure it so we would evolve the minimum of three trades: meaning electric, labor, HVAC. Or we are going to try and structure it that way.

The bill does require Clark County to try, as Mr. Advent had mentioned, 50 percent subcontracting. That was actually really important in the negotiation that we did because the goal was, and I think some of the fear of this delivery method was, that it would be one general contractor that would take all the work. The way that it has worked successfully at the county right now is we have partnered with two very great general contractors—hit the 50 percent of the work, which meant that we are putting work out into our community that was employing our smaller subcontracting firms—both signatory and non-signatory—that were able to get the work.

I know that was really important to when we were working on the bill to try and make sure we are turning the job; the point is to turn the jobs over and to deliver the services quickly, that policy going back to the amendment, the policy of our three trades. We agreed to adopt that at a public hearing at the local government level. This is because this was a new delivery method but now we believe it is like the other cities that now employ it. We will have a little bit more transparency and dialogue with our trifecta, with the contractors, and with the labor stakeholders and the public about what this policy is going to look like. We agreed to do that at a public hearing.

Let me go back to my notes here. I am going to walk you through the bill. That was section 9. Moving on, sections 11 and 13 detail the requirements for the bid and the selection of the general contractor. I want to point out a few things to you here. This is advertised in the same way we advertise all of our construction contracts. In subsection 2, we have to provide potential bidders with the reasons why we would use job order contracting, the types

of jobs covered, and a copy of the policy which I just described. The general contractors you will see submit a request for proposal response covering the provisions in section 11, and they will show their bonding capacity and their insurance and their ability to work with us on the program. On page 7 we have also incorporated the existing bidding preference which is available to local firms. It is selected in the same way as a general construction contract.

There is this, again, I mentioned is an alternative to low bid. There are some protections we have put in place to ensure the delivery method is not overutilized. One of the things I will point out is we have a \$25 million annual limit, or a cap. Mr. Advent talked about the level in the volume that we have to maintain. This is a small subset. It is a small portion of what we deliver globally through RPM [Real Property Management]. That was intended to mean that we are going to try and use it the way it is supposed to be: small jobs, repetitive jobs that come through. This is the requirement to subcontract.

We also put something in that is important to some of the folks in the trades, which is that there is no self-performance for a work that requires a contractor specialty license such as plumbing, HVAC, refrigeration. These are specialty licenses that contractors do and this is important for the subcontracting community. There are other three-three [sic] protections in place on contractor qualifications. They cannot be a job order contractor if they have been disqualified from public work. There are subcontractor substitution protections in place that are the same as if for a regular construction contract. It is important to note, too, that this program will still be under the jurisdiction, as in all other construction contracts, of the labor commissioner for wage and hour provisions. We have built that in and you will see those references in section 14 of the bill.

Section 16 is really the final section. We have been doing reporting, annual reporting. We do quarterly reports to our board, which are part of our public meetings where we detail what we have done in the project. What we have done in the previous quarter, the jobs that have come out, actually Mr. Advent puts them together. They are extensive. We list all of the jobs that have come out and really that is the point, to get eyes on the program and see what is happening.

We have agreed to—this is my final amendment—try and attempt to add upcoming jobs to that quarterly report, meaning there is always going to be a report of what we have done and then what is coming up. We think that is going to be important as the word gets out into the community, especially among our subcontractor community, so they know what is coming and what they can expect.

I would just like to say again before I hand it over to Ms. Barnett: One thing that is very important to me to emphasize is that when working on the bill, there are entities you see that are not in this bill. You will see this is in southern Nevada and not in northern Nevada. There is a reason why that is the case. Northern Nevada, the contractors and the labor unions have different challenges, and they have different challenges in southern Nevada, and so had requested to be exempted out of the bill in 2021, and are still requesting to be out of the bill. We are honoring that request and it is very important, really, for me as the Clark County

Manager, that we have a successful partnership down in southern Nevada. That is why we are limiting it to southern Nevada. On that point, I am going to hand it over to Ms. Barnett. She does some really great work with the Nevada Contractors Association. I think she will tell you about how we have been able to partner and how we might be able to partner in the future on this program.

Anne Barnett, CEO, Nevada Contractors Association:

I am the CEO for the Nevada Contractors Association (NCA) representing the commercial construction industry in southern Nevada. Our membership includes general contractors and subcontractors of all sizes. We have a long history of partnering with the county to make sure that the county's building construction and maintenance needs are met. Like Mr. Advent had testified, many of the county's construction needs are not just these major projects but rather small projects or maintenance projects that are often critical to allow the county to better serve the residents of southern Nevada. Because of this program that allows the county to meet their critical construction needs in a more efficient manner, NCA strongly supports the job order contracting program.

Further, you will hear support testimony in Las Vegas. I am hoping a couple of them were able to stay, as you know that with the agenda change, they are going to try to call in or at least testify in written support. But they have vetted and extremely supported this program and it has complemented our goal of supporting a diverse contractor community. Certainly, our women-owned DBEs [Disadvantaged Business Enterprise] have thrived because of this program.

I like to just mention at NCA we do have a very robust, diverse contractors' council where small and diverse contractors share resources together, host events throughout the year with our general contractors and our public entities to build relationships and expand opportunities. I would like to say it is one of the best examples of our contractor membership that you will find. Clark County has been a leader in ensuring that these businesses can leverage their certifications and compete for work. Assembly Bill 43 strengthens that commitment. Moving forward, we will continue to have Clark County at those meetings to help advertise to our new and upcoming small and diverse contractors to give them the opportunity in the future.

By making the job order contracting permanent, this bill creates consistent opportunities for small and diverse contractors to secure projects which in turn helps them build capacity, helps them build their small businesses, and potentially expand their bonding limits and abilities to perform on public works as they successfully complete more jobs. This again certainly aligns with our association's commitment to supporting small and diverse contractors, ensuring that they are ready, willing, and able, which is their logo, to compete and thrive and help the county to address their construction and maintenance needs. We respectfully ask your support for A.B. 43.

Joanna Jacob:

That concludes our presentation, so we can stand for questions now if there are any from the Committee.

Chair Considine:

We do have some questions. Our first question is from Assemblymember Kasama.

Assemblymember Kasama:

My question is in regard to section 14, subsection 2, in that section I think part of my question was answered in your presentation where it has that a contractor may not perform more than 50 percent of the estimated cost of the job order. It sounds like the intent is to just spread the work out more to get more contractors involved. I was just kind of looking for a 30,000-foot level where this is, because this is not my wheelhouse. Is this customary? Is this something that has been built in for a while? What happens if we cannot find enough subs? Is there an exclusion for that? Just kind of the 30,000-foot level how this clause is in here.

Joanna Jacob:

Sure. The intent truly was to ensure that the work was spread out. I might defer to Mr. Advent here to say, was it difficult for us to hit the 50 percent limit? I think maybe he had mentioned during his presentation that this delivery method allows us to partner with the general contractors to try and structure this in place and to plan to hit the 50 percent. Perhaps Mr. Advent can provide some more details to try and tell you if we have difficulties or if it is customary.

John Advent:

Exactly. The 50 percent was meant so that you could not go right to the contractor under the job order, and they would do all the work themselves. We want sub participation. Our policy was to identify projects that would go into the job order contract program that required three or more, or at a minimum three or more. We did not have any issues with getting subs to participate in these types of projects. The 50 percent participation is just meant to say we are not just throwing this work to a general that is going out and self-performing. That is not the intent of the program. We want the type of projects in that they require the sub participation so that it was not an issue, and that was the intent, to make sure we could have robust participation from the contracting community.

Assemblymember Karris:

You answered most of my questions in your presentation, but I would like, if you can, to expound a little bit more. I am intrigued by section 16, subsection (d) [sic] where we are having contractors or subcontractors with all these very diverse things that need help getting started. Can you just expand a bit on how that works for me, please?

Joanna Jacob:

This is a part of the program that I think we are really proud of because we did agree to the reporting on those categories of participation in the 2021 Session. Just to explain those

designations, and Mr. Advent will correct me if it is not right, but it is like these are designations for the small firms. They self-designate if they are women-owned, small, you know, these categories, and we really partnered at the beginning of the program. I think we did subcontractor fairs. We have partnered with the Nevada Contractors Association to try and advertise the work. This is important. These are sometimes some of the smaller firms that are out there. I hope they are still here, those who are going to testify in support of the bill or will write in afterwards because we actually saw some great success as Ms. Barnett noted. Especially women-owned electrical firms. I think in some of the others that were able to grow their bonding capacity through this.

We reported, if you are interested in what we are able to perform. We did report this to the legislative session on how many of these categories of firms did this work, and it was quite a large number. It was about 10 percent of the overall work. We are proud of that percentage because it is repetitive work and some of these firms were able to get repeat jobs through the course of our four-year pilot program. I hope that answers your question.

Ann Barnett:

Through our diverse contractor's council, we do have different various, I guess, opportunities and steps on where that contractor is within their licensing or their experience. We try to make sure if they, one, have the right licensing, they have the right certifications. And if not, we help them find those right certifications and then how to leverage that. With that we have meetings throughout the year on what those opportunities look like for them to leverage. If, say, Clark County comes in and presents this opportunity, then they will talk about how they can then basically expand or enhance their opportunity to be a part of Clark County's job order contracting. I hope that answers.

Assemblymember Karris:

I guess that means that this program is really working. I can see why you want to continue it.

Assemblymember Gallant:

I think this is really important for us to pass this through and I kind of want to do a liability question for you. I am in property management and like actual knowledge of something. If somebody reports that there is a repair that needs to be done at the house and I blow it off and then somebody gets hurt, I am now liable. However, if it is reported and I fix it or I am in the process of fixing it, that reduces my liability. I am curious. Prior to this pilot program, were there situations in which you were not able to address repairs and maintenance on your existing infrastructure that created an unsafe environment for our residents and possibly, or actually, did cause the county to have increased liability because of that?

Joanna Jacob:

I am going to let Mr. Advent answer this. On the reports that come in when the facilities go down, it is a concern. I think what would happen is we have to close the facilities to address potential injury or anything if it is not repaired in time. I will let him give some more details about how that actually works as it is reported to his division.

John Advent:

Exactly right. If we have an incident where a facility or an amenity is a life-safety issue, if we cannot address it via an emergency declaration, which typically they do not qualify for, it is, in fact, closed down. It would be fenced up, boarded up, taken out of use for the time that it would take us to plan, procure, and implement a construction fix for that.

A good example, I spoke on Winterwood Park being a quick turnaround from a fire. We had another fire at our new Silverbowl Park. One job took six months to get done. This other amenity restroom at a park was down for close to two years while we had to hire an engineer and an architect to design and figure out, scope out, bid, award, get the contractor on, mobilize, and then complete the work. You can see the two differences. One amenity at a park was down for about six months. Liability was lower because it was down for a lesser amount of time. The other one was boarded up, fenced up for close to two years while we worked through the process to get construction services procured. If it is a major item, then there are other means the county can take to effectively get in and fix things, but it is more of just how long that amenity is down and closed and not available to the public.

Assemblymember Flanagan:

There is a lot of really good subgroups included in this. I am wondering, is there a way to work in, since you have signatory and non-signatory contractors, the inclusion of apprenticeships? Like maybe just a small amount of apprenticeship consideration in it?

Joanna Jacob:

We have actually looked at apprenticeship utilization and I know that it has been a challenge. You will hear about some of the challenges in this Committee specifically, maybe, through other bills that are coming. I know that we looked at apprenticeship at the beginning of the program. The issue is frequently the way that they work is there are waivers in place that can be sought if the apprenticeships are not available. It is the existing law of the state. I think the other benefit of this program is sort of by helping to partner with the small firms. We are still doing the main goal of the apprenticeship program, which is to help grow our construction workforce. I know we did look at apprenticeships originally when we were first doing the beginning of the pilot. There are some challenges to this. These are small jobs and often it is something we can talk about for sure. I think it has been a struggle.

Chair Considine:

Committee members, any other questions? Not seeing any other questions, thank you for the presentation and we will now hear testimony on the bill. First, we will hear testimony in support of Assembly Bill 43, and we will begin here in Carson City. Go ahead when you are ready.

Warren B. Hardy II, representing Associated Builders and Contractors Nevada; and Urban Consortium:

I have two clients who are in strong support of this: Associated Builders and Contractors of Nevada as well as the Urban Consortium, which is made up of the cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, Reno, and Sparks. I did a bill on job order contracting. I think it was

in 2005. It was a very new concept to government at that time. This process has been used very effectively by the military, I think starting with the Navy. It is a really good process and it has always been a really good process for the governments or the owners to be able to get involved in this type of thing.

What is so miraculous and beautiful about this bill? If you ask me with my 30-some-odd years' experience in the construction industry to sit down and write a bill designed to allow small businesses, new businesses, women/minority-owned businesses to get involved in the mainstream of the construction industry, this is the bill I would have written. I want to strongly associate myself with the comments of Ann Barnett, who talked about how effective this is going to be to bringing new folks in. I appreciate Assemblymember Flanagan's questions about apprentices. This is a place where somebody can move from an apprenticeship program into a business themselves because they have a beautiful opportunity now to do something they can handle, that their company can handle, that they can work on. This is one of the strongest, best pieces of legislation I have seen in a long time, and we are in full support.

Wesley Harper, Director of Government Affairs, City of North Las Vegas:

This program is a resource for the City and we appreciate our ability to be able to take advantage of it. For that reason, we are in support.

Chair Considine:

Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support of Assembly Bill 43? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas? Please go ahead when you are ready.

Josh Guisti, Nevada/Energy Division Manager, Sletten Construction Company:

We are a proud union contractor signatory to four different unions. Our business model really revolves around public works, and the job order contracting process has been amazing for us in many ways. A couple of those are, it has provided us more project opportunities than we have ever seen in our 60 years as a Nevada contractor. It has also provided us an outreach program and an ability to bring in way more subcontractor base, specifically small businesses. I mean these are contractors that normally do not have bonding or perhaps license limits large enough for a large project. It has really opened our eyes and expanded our base in the subcontracting market. Beyond that, the program has really helped expand our community involvement. One of the best moments I had is when we finished the Searchlight Park. We went down for the opening of it and just watching the kids and the joy on their faces, they are splashing in the new pad, really is why Sletten Construction strongly supports continuing the JOC [Job Order Contracting] program.

Heather Avila, President and CEO, Live Electric Inc.:

We are a union signatory, Nevada-based, woman-owned small business and certified disadvantaged business enterprise specializing in industrial, commercial, and public works electrical contracting. My company has performed on job order contracts for Clark County Real Property Management. Those contracts allowed us to create and retain jobs for Nevada citizens. Keeping the JOC program would allow contractors like Live Electric to continue to

create and retain jobs working on projects that better the community in which we live and work while efficiently and cost effectively delivering services to the public entities.

I attended the outreach event referenced earlier by Clark County. Clark County is incredibly supportive to the small-business community to help us grow and better our businesses, making sure that the contractors utilized on their projects are qualified, and capable to provide exemplary service to the county. To speak to the previous question on apprentice utilization on those projects, we are able to utilize over 30 percent of apprentices on our overall total labor. I strongly urge lawmakers to support A.B. 43 and make the job order contracting program permanent.

Chair Considine:

Is there anyone else in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of Assembly Bill 43? [There was no one.] We will move to the phone lines. Is there anyone online in support of A.B. 43?

Tiesha Moore, President, G3 Electrical:

Assembly Bill 43 is a critical step toward ensuring the efficiency and sustainability of public works contracting in Nevada by removing the sunset provision and making the job order contracting program permanent. This bill provides stability and predictability for small and diverse contractors like mine, allowing us to plan for future work opportunities with confidence. The job order contracting process streamlines procurement for essential maintenance repair and minor construction projects. This is especially important for me as a small business owner as it creates and simplifies the process for us and allows us to easily participate in contracting opportunities without the burdens and delays of other bidding processes. By supporting A.B. 43 we are promoting job creation, economic growth, and greater participation from diverse contractors who are committed to delivering quality public infrastructure projects. I respectfully urge your support for A.B. 43.

Chair Considine:

We will now move to testimony in opposition to A.B. 43. Is there anyone here in Carson City who wishes to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] We will move to Las Vegas. Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 43? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the lines in opposition to A.B. 43? [There was no one.]

That leaves testimony in neutral. Is there anyone here in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral on A.B. 43? [There was no one.] Anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in neutral on A.B. 43? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Would the sponsors like to make any final remarks? Please go ahead when you are ready.

Joanna Jacob:

Not a ton of remarks, though I did want to say thank you to Sletten and Live Electric that testified in southern Nevada and for Ms. Moore calling in. It is difficult sometimes for contractors to come out in the morning to do hearings. Thank you for taking your time to help us support the bill. I wanted to say that and thank you also to the Committee for your

support and the comments and questions today. We look forward to working with you on continuing to see the bill proceed.

Chair Considine:

I will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 43 and we will move to our next item on the agenda, public comment. Is there anyone here in Carson City, Las Vegas or on the line wishing to provide public comment? [There was no one.]

Our next meeting will be Friday, March 7, 2025, at 8 a.m. in Room 3143. That concludes our meeting for today. The meeting is adjourned [at 9:41 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karri Hurwitz
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblymember Venicia Considine, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 263	C	Assemblymember Erica Mosca, Assembly District No. 14	PowerPoint presentation titled "Assembly Bill 263"
A.B. 263	D	Assemblymember Erica Mosca, Assembly District No. 14	Proposed conceptual amendment titled "Proposed Conceptual Amendment to Assembly Bill 263"
A.B. 263	E	Assemblymember Erica Mosca, Assembly District No. 14	Video titled "Mosca Video.mp4"
A.B. 263	F	Mathilda Miller, Government Relations Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada	Letter in support
A.B. 263	G	Rudy Zamora, Advocacy Director, Chicanos Por La Causa	Letter in support
A.B. 263	H	Harold K. "Mike" Bashay, Principal, K.O. Knudson Academy of the Arts	Letter in support
A.B. 43	I	Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County	Proposed amendment