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

Eighty-Third Session
April 4, 2025

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 3:56 p.m. on Friday, April 4, 2025, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 2 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. Link to Executive Budget.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair
Assemblymember Shea M. Backus, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Natha C. Anderson
Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May
Assemblymember Jill Dickman
Assemblymember Gregory T. Hafen II
Assemblymember Brian Hibbetts
Assemblymember Sandra Jauregui
Assemblymember Erica Mosca
Assemblymember PK O'Neill
Assemblymember Selena Torres-Fossett
Assemblymember Howard Watts
Assemblymember Steve Yeager

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblymember Gregory S. Koenig (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane Thornton, Acting Director
Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Joi Guthrie, Committee Manager
Natalia Jordan, Committee Manager
Jake Matthews, Committee Secretary
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Cameron Gresh, Government Affairs Liaison, City of Carson City
Clay Mitchell, Vice Chair, Storey County Board of Commissioners; and Vice Chair, V&T Railway Commission
Donna Inversin, President, Historic Virginia and Truckee Trail
Kim Fegert, Private Citizen, Virginia City, Nevada
Andrew MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Nic Ciccone, Government Affairs Manager, City of Reno
Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Clark County
Michael Hillerby, representing City of Sparks
Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County
Mendy Elliot, representing Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority
Aaron Sheets, Chief Executive Officer, HopeLink of Southern Nevada
Kendra Bertschy, Justice of the Peace, Reno Justice Court
Jessica Goodey, Justice of the Peace, Las Vegas Justice Court

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were discussed.] We will get started with our bill introduction. I will remind you that your vote today is not a vote in favor of this measure; it is just to get the bill draft request in the process of becoming a bill.

BDR 43-1127—Revises provisions relating to vessels. (Later introduced as Assembly Bill 548)

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
I will accept a motion to introduce bill draft request 43-1127.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO INTRODUCE BILL DRAFT REQUEST 43-1127.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

Next up is our work session, and I will turn it over to our Fiscal Analyst, Ms. Coffman.

Assembly Bill 232: Makes changes to the computation of credit for service for certain members of the Public Employees' Retirement System. (BDR 23-402)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:
Today, we will work session three bills. The first bill on work session is Assembly Bill 232. Assembly Bill 232 was heard by the Committee on Ways and Means on March 28, 2025. Assemblymember Carter was the primary presenter. This bill would provide that the school district employees receive a full year of service credits if they worked at least 900 hours in a school year. The change would apply to both employees of the school districts as well as professional staff for the Nevada System of Higher Education. There was a conceptual amendment that was requested at the hearing. Assemblymember Carter proposed a conceptual amendment to clarify the 900 hours must be across at least 8 calendar months of a school year. There were 14 individuals in support of the bill, 1 individual who was in opposition, and none in neutral. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 232.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 232.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblymember Hafen:
I believe the conceptual amendment addresses some of my concerns. I am going to vote this out of Committee, but I do want to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor, just so I can see the final language.

Assemblymember Dickman:
Ditto.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
Is there any other discussion? [There was none.]

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

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Carter. The next item on our work session is Assembly Bill 347. I will turn it over to Ms. Coffman.

Assembly Bill 347: Revises provisions relating to state financial administration. (BDR 31-936)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:
Assembly Bill 347 was heard in the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means on March 28, 2025. This bill increases the threshold for allowing receipts of gifts and grants from nongovernmental sources that do not exceed $500,000. Any new expenditure authority that would be supported from a gift or grant from nongovernmental sources exceeding $500,000 for an executive budget account would require approval from the Interim Finance Committee. There was one individual who was in opposition to this at the hearing, and there were no amendments.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
Members, do you have any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 347.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BACKUS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 347.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

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

I will assign the floor statement to myself. The last bill on work session is Assembly Bill 355. I will turn it over to Ms. Coffman.

Assembly Bill 355: Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 34-937)

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst:
Assembly Bill 355 was heard in the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means on March 28, 2025. The primary sponsor of the bill was Chair Monroe-Moreno. The bill provides that any money remaining in the Fund to Assist School Districts in Financing

Capital Improvements, as well as the Fund to Assist Rural School Districts in Financing Capital Improvements, at the end of the year must not revert to the General Fund and must be carried forward to the next fiscal year.

There was an amendment that was proposed by Silver State Government Relations. That amendment provides in *Nevada Revised Statutes* 387.3343 that, to the extent that money is available for that purpose in the Fund to Assist Rural School Districts in Financing Capital Improvements and if the Director of the Office of Finance determines that the capital project for which the grant is requested is a project for which a grant may be made from the Fund, the Director shall make a grant of money from the Fund to a school district that submits an application in an amount that is equal to: any gifts, grants, or donations given to the school districts for a specific project on qualified tribal lands; or any interest accrued by the counties or school districts through the retention of funds held for the purposes of building a specific project on qualified tribal land.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
Members, do you have any questions? [There were none.]

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER BACKUS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 355.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

> THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBER KOENIG WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to myself. The first bill that will be heard on tonight's agenda is Assembly Bill 32.

Assembly Bill 32: Directs the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure to conduct a study during the 2025-2026 interim concerning the Nevada Commission for the Reconstruction of the V&T Railway of Carson City and Storey County. (BDR S-404)

Cameron Gresh, Government Affairs Liaison, City of Carson City:
This bill, Assembly Bill 32, was heard in its committee of origin, which is the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure. As such, I know some of us here today have heard the pitch before, so I am going to keep it quite abridged to focus on the fiscal impacts that we anticipate from the bill, which are to say, minimal to none.

To give you a little bit of context, A.B. 32 would direct the 2025-2026 Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure to conduct a study of the Commission for the V&T Railway for the following purposes: reorganizing the structure of the Commission or

modifying the duties or powers of it; improving its long-term financial viability; or terminating the Commission and addressing related issues including, without limitation, disposition of the assets of the Commission. These are the three main focuses of the study that we are requesting in this bill.

Our reasons for doing so can be summed up as the following: Carson City and Storey County are in the position of having to manage a business enterprise centered on tourism with no clear path for growth of the railway in the future. We have no rolling stock; we have no storage or shop or repair facilities; and though the tourism revenue provided by the railroad in its current state is not enough to offset the cost of maintaining the aging structures or operating historic locomotives, we do still operate in the black. However, it is becoming harder as our communities'—both Storey County and Carson City—infrastructure needs continue to grow, as I know many of you have heard from municipalities and townships in your own districts.

I will turn it over to Commissioner Mitchell, but not without saying that, as far as fiscal impacts go, we do not foresee any in our initial drafting of the bill. However, we would like to point out that the V&T Commission is available—as it comes to staff time or anything like that, we are more than happy to help. If there would be any fiscal impact at all, we would anticipate it would be in the form of staff time. As the requesters of this study, we are more than happy to assist as the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure Committee needs.

Clay Mitchell, Vice Chair, Storey County Board of Commissioners; and Vice Chair, V&T Railway Commission:
I wanted to reiterate what Cameron said—both from the Railway Commission perspective and from the local jurisdictions—we are happy to provide staff resources to help with research, collection of data, and analysis to help that committee study go forward.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
Members, do you have any questions for the presenters? [There were none.]

We have our Acting Director, Ms. Thornton, here in the room. I know that the Legislative Counsel Bureau has indicated there would be a fiscal impact but could not determine it at the time. Could you come to the table and discuss that?

Diane Thornton, Acting Director:
Yes, we did indicate that we could not determine the fiscal impact only because last interim, each joint interim committee was budgeted for six meetings. Whether this study could take place within the scope of the joint interim committee—it may or it may not. The members may determine that it needs additional meetings at which point that would include extra per diem and travel, and that is why we did not estimate.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
I want to make sure that I understand it correctly. The six meetings are already absorbed in the budget that we have. If it were to go over six meetings, would that be an additional cost that was not in our budget?

Diane Thornton:
Correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
Members, are there any questions for Ms. Thornton?

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett:
I know that we had a similar conversation in the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs over the interim. I am wondering why this was not something that could have been discussed at that time because there was the capacity for the Committee. I am not understanding what is going to be different by having a study in this way as opposed to the work that could have been done this interim.

Clay Mitchell:
You will have to refresh my memory. I believe there was a presentation that was made. I do not know if what came out of that interim conversation was guidance from the Legislature on where we can go with this body. An informational presentation was made about the status of the body, and we have been looking at different options for sustainable growth in the future, and we felt like we did not have all the resources we needed from a knowledge perspective to know what is possible because it is a state commission. We at the local level are supporting it with local taxes, but we are unclear if this commission should stop operating, and if we were to dispose of the assets, who would receive the revenue from those assets. Would it go to the state? Would it go to the local jurisdictions that have floated the taxes to fund this? This is where we are looking for guidance to know what is possible so that we can make a plan going forward.

Assemblymember Torres-Fossett:
I am not entirely sure that this is necessary. I feel like this is something that could be done with stakeholder conversations. I have more questions, but I can continue that offline.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] We will invite to the table anyone who is here to testify in support of Assembly Bill 32.

Donna Inversin, President, Historic Virginia and Truckee Trail:
We are a nonprofit building a rail trail that will mimic the old Virginia and Truckee Railroad. So far, we have 45 miles built from City Plaza in Reno to south Carson City. As a nonprofit, we feel like we would be good partners, should the Commission be revamped, to create a rail trail with the railroad and be a part of that. If it is decommissioned, we would be hopeful that we would not lose the right of way that a lot of time and money was invested, and that could

be used to build the rail trail to Virginia City. Once the rail trail is completed, five counties will be connected. Since we connect to the Tahoe-Pyramid Trail on the north, and we connect to the Martin Slough Trail on the south, we will attract visitors from all over the world for one- to two-week bikepacking and end-to-end hiking trips that will go from the dam at Lake Tahoe to Pyramid Lake to Carson City to Virginia City to Gardnerville, Genoa, and Douglas County. This would be a big asset to northern Nevada. We feel like we would be a big asset for this area.

[Exhibit C and Exhibit D were submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Kim Fegert, Private Citizen, Virginia City, Nevada:
I used to run an operation called the Gold Hill Historical Society, and I have personally been involved in this project since its conception in the early 1990s. Using our operation as a tool, we managed to contribute to the project early on—almost $1 million as far as in-kind donations, grants, and such—to get the whole thing off the ground. So, that will give you an idea of my interest in this. One thing that ended up in us being here is when the Commission was constructed, it was built with some operational flaws that I think have prevented the whole thing from being able to live up to its potential. It does not have a lot of other ways, besides tax money and what little revenue otherwise it pulls in, to create enhancements and do a better job of attracting its base customers. There is not a lot of support in the area for something that does not look like it is going to benefit a lot of the businesses which, of course, was what the project was sold on. The original engineering study, which I reviewed not too long ago, indicated that there should be a minimum of 160,000 riders a year if everything was in place, similar to other operations throughout the United States. The last numbers that I am aware of—it hovers around between 8,000 and 12,000 riders a year. So, you can see that there is quite a bit of difference between what it was projected to provide to the tourist economy and what it has been able to manage to do. I think a lot of that is because, for all intents, it has just been managed as expediency almost from the start rather than an ongoing project that needs further development.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
I thank you so much for your comments. We have passed the two-minute mark. If you have any written comments, you can leave those with our Committee secretary to put them into the record.

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 32? [There was no one.] We will close support, and we will move to opposition. Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 32? [There was no one.] We will move to the neutral position. Is there anyone who would like to testify in neutral on Assembly Bill 32? [There was no one.] With that, I will invite the presenters to come back for any closing remarks.

Cameron Gresh:
We understand that since this is a more fiscally focused committee, we glossed over a lot of the reasoning and background behind how the V&T Railroad Commission works. However, we are more than happy to have those discussions offline, and if there is anything more we can provide, please let us know.

Clay Mitchell:
I want to reinforce that while this operation continues, some of the unique structural aspects of it and the history of the state, federal, and local funding coming together—it has a unique structure, and that is why we are asking for a little bit of help to figure out if there is the commitment to continued growth or if we need to look at other ways to make sure that it is financially viable or, if it is not, to then figure out what those options are as well.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
Thank you for being here tonight, and I encourage you to continue the conversations that Assemblymember Torres-Fossett mentioned when she questioned you.

With that, we will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 32, and we will move to the next item on our agenda, Assembly Bill 117. We will invite one of our own members to the table. Assemblymember Brown-May, you can start when you are ready.

Assembly Bill 117: Revises provisions relating to special license plates. (BDR 43-48)

Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May, Assembly District No. 42:
I am here today to present Assembly Bill 117, which is a special license plate honoring the Las Vegas Aces. The fiscal note on this is $0 from the Department of Motor Vehicles. Additionally, they have requested an amendment to put back in a clause that we inadvertently left out requiring an audit to ensure the funds from the purchase of the specialty license plates are audited and go to the nonprofit's mission as many other plates are [Exhibit E].

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
I am in receipt of their email and the email saying that even with the amendment, the fiscal note would still be $0. Members, do you have any questions for Assemblymember Brown-May? [There were none.] We will invite anyone who is here to testify in support of Assembly Bill 117.

Andrew MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:
At risk of stepping on perhaps a third rail of Nevada legislative politics, I am going to somewhat hit on policy. I was not able to make the committee meeting. I want to make sure we put it on the record that we support the bill, particularly with respect to the language in section 3, subsection 3, paragraph (d), subparagraph (1). Oftentimes, we will register a vehicle on behalf of our customers; they want a specialty plate, and we are unable to do it. This is going to fix it, and we are going to be able to provide better service to the vehicle buyers in the state of Nevada.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
Do we have anyone else who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 117? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 117? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] With that, we will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 117.

[Assemblymember Backus assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Backus:
I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 475.

Assembly Bill 475: Makes appropriations to Clark County and the City of Reno for eviction diversion programs. (BDR S-1094)

Assemblymember Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1:
The reason this bill is important—knowing the times that we are living in are going to get a little bit more interesting than they have been—there is a need and has been a need for eviction support in our state, and I believe it is only going to get greater. With your permission, Vice Chair, I will turn it over to Mr. Norman to go into the details of the bill and some amendments.

Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers:
Nevada has around 85,000 summary evictions filed every year. In the 2023 Session, there was an appropriation in Assembly Bill 396 of the 82nd Session to Clark County, Reno, and Sparks. It was a total of $12 million for Clark County, $3 million for Reno, and $3 million for Sparks. In the time since then, that money has been put to good use. The Las Vegas Justice Court built on a program and Reno Justice Court stood up a program for eviction diversion nested within the courts.

To show the power of that, 81 percent of tenants in Las Vegas who participated in that program avoided eviction—that is 1,928 households. At the start of the program, tenants had a 65 percent no-show rate for their diversion appointment. We have shrunk that to a 25 percent no-show rate. Landlord engagement has improved. Of the diverted cases in 2024, 1,375 were households with an adult with a disability, and 575 were seniors.

In Reno Justice Court, that program started later, but they were giving rental assistance countywide the whole time. Ninety-four households went through the eviction diversion program, and 80 percent of those remained housed. Of those, 72 percent remained in the same unit 90 days later. So, the effectiveness of eviction diversion programs is shown in the last 2 years.

When we go to questions, we have folks in those courts and from those jurisdictions who can testify. We have Nic Ciccone from the City of Reno; Monica Kirch, who is the Director of Housing and Neighborhood Development for the City of Reno; Elaine Wiseman, who is the

Housing Manager for the City of Reno; and Joanna Jacob from Clark County. In addition, we are joined here by Judge Bertschy, who leads the housing court in Reno Justice Court; and in Las Vegas, we have Judge Goodey, who does the same in Las Vegas Justice Court.

I will do a brief walkthrough of the bill. Section 1 of the bill makes an appropriation to Clark County for $18 million for eviction diversion programs. Subsection 2 allows subgrants for the same purpose and allows up to 10 percent of that money to be used to administer the program. Subsection 3 requires reporting of expenditures to the Interim Finance Committee. Subsection 4 sets the timeline the money must be committed and spent by and requires reversion to the State General Fund by September 2027. Section 2 of the bill makes an appropriation to the City of Reno for $7 million for eviction diversion programs. The remainder of section 2 tracks the same language as section 1. Section 3 of the bill is the effective passage date upon approval.

There is an amendment from Washoe County which adds a provision to section 2, subsection 5 that explicitly requires the City of Reno to service unincorporated Washoe County and the City of Sparks. So, all residents in the City of Sparks, the City of Reno, and unincorporated Washoe County have the same criteria for being eligible for assistance. This provision puts into the bill what has been the practice of the City of Reno over the interim. With the appropriation in A.B. 396 of the 82nd Session, the City of Reno serviced the entire unincorporated Washoe County, the City of Reno, and the City of Sparks. The folks who are in our phone-a-friend category here have data to back up that they have serviced the whole region.

Vice Chair Backus:
Members, do we have any questions for the presenters?

Assemblymember O'Neill:
I like the bill. I know that we have experienced issues with rentals, and rental assistance is needed statewide. As a representative of Assembly District 40, which includes a lot of the rurals, historically, I think we have left out the rurals by accident—possibly last session or so. Has there been any consideration for adding funding to address our rurals?

Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno:
I am going to let Mr. Norman speak to what happened last session. I will say what happened this session. This bill was modeled off of the bill from last session. I did receive an email today at 1:17 p.m., but I have been in committee meetings since 7:00 a.m. this morning, so I have not had an opportunity to review this amendment. I will review the amendment, and if it is amenable to add to the bill, then I will add that for the work session, but I was not looking through it today.

Assemblymember O'Neill:
I appreciate that. I have been with you at several of those committee meetings today, so you actually got it before I did, but I wanted to bring it up. I would appreciate the conversation. I should remember what happened in 2023, but I will say I forgot.

Jonathan Norman:
I appreciate the question. There is no intention to leave out Nevadans in the state from rental assistance. Last session, the rurals decided that they had enough of the tranches of money that had come with American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), and they did not need an appropriation for that biennium.

Assemblymember O'Neill:
May I just add, from sitting on the Salvation Army board with our small allotment that we had, we went through our small allotment for rental assistance left and right. Also, my church has gone through it, so I am more aware of it. You are right; we had it. I would appreciate the conversation.

Vice Chair Backus:
Members, are there any other questions for our presenters? [There were none.] We can take testimony in support of Assembly Bill 475.

Nic Ciccone, Government Affairs Manager, City of Reno:
Thank you to the bill sponsor for bringing forward this bill. Last session, when A.B. 396 of the 82nd Session was amended to include the City of Reno, that was one of the proudest moments of my life, and it went a long way. We serviced about 1,400 individuals, leveraging other federal funding, to keep people housed. That was important to me and to the City of Reno.

Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Clark County:
I wanted to say ditto to my colleague from the City of Reno. We are very thankful for the appropriation last session. Additionally, thank you again to this legislative body for the additional appropriation to Clark County. We have historically been serving our community with rental assistance and eviction prevention efforts since the CARES Act [Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act] and then with the ARPA funds. We have been deploying multiple versions of the funding. From January 1, 2024, to just yesterday, we have served, with our existing eviction prevention programs, over 2,400 households. With our fixed income program, we have served about 585 households. That is for folks living on social security benefits, Veterans Affairs benefits, or pension benefits who cannot adjust to market pressures.

There were some comments about how the City of Reno has, like Clark County, been supporting their other jurisdictions. I thought you might be interested that during that time period, we served 1,277 families in the City of Las Vegas; 127 families in Henderson; and 185 families in North Las Vegas. I would like to say for Clark County, we do not look at zip code. We do this for our region.

Michael Hillerby, representing the City of Sparks:
I also ditto those comments. Thank you to the sponsor for bringing this forward. Thank you for your consideration. We appreciate the collegiality of our sister local governments in the Truckee Meadows.

Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County:
As you heard from Mr. Norman during the bill presentation, Washoe County does have an amendment that we would ask that you consider to this bill to make it clear that the funding that is being appropriated to the City of Reno should be available to all residents of Washoe County [Exhibit F].

We would like to commend the work that the City of Reno did with the money that was awarded to them under A.B. 396 of the 82nd Session. They have done an incredible job in putting together programs that have been to the benefit of all of the residents in our community. We have no concern that they would not do that going forward but, as we know, things change and people in roles change, so we felt it was important to have that clarity here in the bill. We would like to thank Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno for her leadership on this and Assemblymember Anderson for your push last session to be sure that money was also included for northern Nevada.

Mendy Elliot, representing Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority:
We are in strong support of A.B. 475. We want to thank the bill sponsor. We have heard the statistics; they speak for themselves. This funding goes a long way, whether it is in Reno, or Washoe County, or in Clark County, or wherever it might help us. We want to commend Assemblymember Daniele Monroe-Moreno for her leadership and caring for our citizens in the state.

Aaron Sheets, Chief Executive Officer, HopeLink of Southern Nevada:
HopeLink is a lead distributor of rental assistance in southern Nevada. We are happy to support A.B. 475. In 2024 alone, HopeLink distributed over $8 million consisting of more than 5,500 rental assistance payments directly to landlords and property managers, stopping evictions and securing stability for over 15,000 Nevadans. The infusion of $25 million to Nevada for eviction diversion efforts is critical to keep at-risk Nevadans housed as these efforts are the most cost-effective homelessness prevention interventions that we have available to us. We appreciate Speaker Yeager and the Legislature for supporting eviction diversion efforts and look forward to helping the community for many years to come.

Vice Chair Backus:
Is there anyone else wishing to provide testimony in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in opposition? [There was no one.]

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

We will go to testimony in neutral on Assembly Bill 475.

Kendra Bertschy, Justice of the Peace, Reno Justice Court:
I am the individual who has the privilege of presiding over our eviction diversion court or, as we refer to it, housing court. In August 2024, we partnered with the City of Reno to create this housing court program. We were able to provide expedited rental assistance to tenants

while also providing supportive services. We partnered with Legal Aid and with Nation's Finest who assist veterans in this sphere. So, instead of utilizing the money from the City of Reno, we were able to also use funds from Nation's Finest where we have been able to ensure that 100 percent of individuals who worked with Nation's Finest have remained in their homes. We have also provided them with job opportunity training and access to supportive services such as TANF [Temporary Assistance for Needy Families] assistance or things of that nature to ensure that they have what they need to be successful and sustainable. That is why we have created this program to ensure that landlords are paid quicker with the rental assistance—thanks to a lot of the hard work from the City of Reno—but also to ensure that they remain in their homes and do not come back to the court for evictions.

Without the rental assistance funding our pilot project cannot continue. Based off of our data, the housing court program—which is only a small blip in what the City of Reno needs—will require at least $1 million annually in rental assistance to sustain it. The appropriation in A.B. 475 will allow the City of Reno to continue to support tenants in housing court as well as assisting other tenants facing eviction. The need for legislative support for rental assistance remains urgent. Economic challenges, medical emergencies, and other unforeseen events continue to put renters at risk of eviction. Without continued funding, many people will face housing instability, increasing the burden on emergency services, shelters, and the judicial system—ultimately costing taxpayers more. This funding is a crucial investment in community stability, public safety, and responsible governance. Assembly Bill 475 is not just about rental assistance; it is about preventing avoidable evictions and ensuring long-term housing security.

Jessica Goodey, Justice of the Peace, Las Vegas Justice Court:
I am here to provide some additional information regarding the success of our eviction diversion program currently in place that this bill would allow to continue. The eviction diversion program has made significant strides in reducing evictions and increasing tenant engagement. First, I would like to provide the Committee with some data regarding the filed evictions. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, Las Vegas Justice Court had approximately 30,000 cases filed per year. Since the pandemic, we have continued to see record high eviction filings. In 2024, Las Vegas Justice Court had 43,030 evictions filed. To date in 2025, we have had 9,885 evictions, and we are anticipating that number to continue to increase with the current state of affairs.

The program is currently limited to serving our most vulnerable populations—the elderly and disabled. The Las Vegas Justice Court eviction diversion program has successfully assisted over 3,150 households. Of those, 56 percent included individuals with disabilities, 24 percent were elderly, and the remaining 20 percent had at least one household member who was both elderly and disabled. Thanks to the efforts of the eviction diversion program and our amazing staff, 77 percent of the participants were able to avoid an eviction on their record.

To help with this, we have expanded the contact we are having with our tenants. They have approximately ten touch points with the court throughout the process. The initial contact is in person or over the phone where they schedule an appointment with our social services. After

scheduling, they receive two emails from the court; one with the order assigning them to the eviction diversion program, and another with a calendar invite to add to their schedule. Following this, the tenants receive seven additional reminders about their appointments which include one phone call, three text messages and three email reminders. This has allowed us to reduce our no-show rate from 65 percent to 25 percent. At both the initial court meeting and the appointment with social services, tenants are provided with information about additional resources available to them. This allows them to have wider access to support from financial assistance to housing and social services, helping to address the broader needs.

Since December 2023, a total of $5,553,824.80 in rental assistance has been distributed. It is important to note that money has gone directly to the landlords, so we are assisting both the tenants and the landlords in allowing effective and efficient resolution of the eviction cases. Our hope through continued funding to expand this program—we are already in the process of expanding it to our mobile home communities—is that we will expand to households with young children. The continued funding of this program is vital to reducing evictions for the most vulnerable populations.

Vice Chair Backus:
Is there anyone else wishing to give testimony in neutral on Assembly Bill 475? [There was no one.] With that, we invite the bill sponsor back up for any closing remarks.

Jonathan Norman:
Judge Goodey mentioned something that I want to put a point on. The reason the ask is higher is because we do want to expand beyond seniors and adults with disabilities to those families with young kids. In Clark County, there are about 1,600 families with a child under the age of one who are at risk for eviction, so this would allow us to route those cases to eviction diversion programs as well.

Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno:
I wanted to thank Assemblymember Anderson for the work she did during the 2023 Session to make sure that families were taken care of. I also want to thank her again on the record for traveling throughout our entire state—visiting all 17 counties—and seeing how these dollars impacted families in our state.

Vice Chair Backus:
We will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 475 and open the hearing for Assembly Bill 506.

Assembly Bill 506: Revises provisions relating to governmental administration. (BDR 18-934)

Assemblymember Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1:
Here is the boring part of our evening. As I have told this Committee, I knew we did not have a lot of money to do a lot of great things. We are going to spend some time cleaning up some things to make our jobs a lot easier, more efficient, and better. That is what

Assembly Bill 506 is; it revises provisions relating to governmental administration. It eliminates several reporting requirements that currently mandate various state agencies, departments, and entities to submit reports to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) when the Legislature is not in session.

The bill will eliminate the following reporting requirements to the IFC:

- The requirement that the Attorney General submit annual statements on the Registry Account.

- The requirement that the Executive Director of the Office of Economic Development within the Office of the Governor submit a report on certain economic development programs related to the Catalyst Account.

- The requirement that the Director of the Department of Corrections submit a report on accounts receivable for prison industries.

- The requirement that the Legislative Bureau of Educational Accountability and Program Evaluation submit reports to certain legislative bodies in odd-numbered years.

- The requirement that the Merit Award Board submit a report on employee suggestions.

- The requirement that local governments submit performance contract reports to the IFC.

- The requirement that the Purchasing Division report on contracts with veteran-owned businesses.

- The requirement that state boards or commissions that hire consultants submit a report setting forth certain information about the consultant pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 333.705(7).

- The requirement that the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plan of Nevada submit an annual report regarding the Nevada Higher Education Prepaid Tuition Trust Fund.

- The requirement that the State Board of Education submit a quarterly report on variances from the pupil-teacher ratios that are requested by a school district.

- The requirement that the Department of Health and Human Services report on child care grants.

- The requirement that local air pollution control agencies report annually on the use of money received from the Pollution Control Account.

- The reporting requirements for special distributions from the Contingency Account related to water rights.

- The requirement that the State Contractor's Board submit a report regarding the Recovery Fund.

- The requirement that the University of Nevada, Reno, School of Medicine submit a report on cannabis research.

- The requirement that the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation and the Housing Division of the Department of Business and Industry report on contractual relationships with nonprofit collaboratives in creating jobs in the fields of energy efficiency and renewable energy.

- The requirement that the State Public Works Board, school districts, and the Board of Regents report on certain projects for weatherization and retrofitting.

- The requirement that the Public Utilities Commission submit reorganization plans to the IFC.

- The reporting requirements on certain sales and use tax-related proceeds under the Clark County Sales and Use Tax Act of 2005. Section 13.3 of the Clark County Sales and Use Tax Act of 2005 contained a provision requiring certain information to be reported to the IFC. Specifically, those reports related to the expenditures made using these revenues from July 1, 2013, to June 30, 2016, that supplanted other revenue sources during that period. These reports can continue to be submitted to the IFC even after June 30, 2016, which was the expiration date by Clark County. However, they were not required. As such, the provisions can be eliminated.

- Reporting on school district's consultants pursuant to NRS 391.155.

I can stand for questions and justification for any of the items being removed.

Assemblymember Dickman:
Did you go through every single one? You found a lot of them, but I bet there are more.

Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno:
I would love to say I was that dedicated, but I have to say we have amazing staff that did this.

Vice Chair Backus:
Members, do you have any other questions? [There were none.] With that, we will open testimony in support of Assembly Bill 506. Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone here wishing to give testimony in neutral? [There was no one.]

I will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 506 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 507.

Assembly Bill 507: Revises provisions relating to state financial administration. (BDR 31-933)

Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1:
Assembly Bill 507 is another one of those cleanup bills for the Committee on Ways and Means. Assembly Bill 507 would establish a minimum threshold for a work program to require approval by the Interim Finance Committee (IFC).

Under the provisions of the bill, for the revision of a work program to require approval by the IFC, the request must: (1) propose a revision in one or more of the categories of expense within the work program in a total amount of more than $75,000, regardless of any other revisions of the work program during the fiscal year; and (2) cumulatively, based on other revisions of the work program during the fiscal year, increase or decrease by 20 percent or $350,000, whichever is less, the expenditure level approved by the Legislature for any of the categories of expense within the work program.

This bill attempts to clarify the legislative intent behind the two-part test required for work programs submitted to the IFC. There has been some confusion over the current language because it does not explicitly state that there is a two-part test to determine if a work program requires IFC approval. This has led to numerous work programs submitted for IFC approval that are below the initial $75,000 threshold. This bill seeks to specify that a work program must first meet the $75,000 minimum threshold. If it does, it must also result in an increase or decrease of at least 20 percent or $350,000, whichever is lower, in the expenditure level approved by the Legislature for any expense category in order for it to require IFC approval. In addition, this bill provides that a proposed revision of a work program must not be divided into separate requests to avoid the minimum threshold.

Vice Chair Backus:
Members, do we have any questions for our Chair?

Assemblymember Dickman:
I love these cleanup bills. Keep doing more.

Vice Chair Backus:
I will echo that. I said that to Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno earlier today. We may see what she is doing now, and those who follow her may not realize it, but they will benefit from this work.

We will open it up for testimony in support of Assembly Bill 507. Is there anyone wishing to give testimony in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in neutral? [There was no one.]

The presenter is waiving closing comments, so I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 507 and turn it back over to our Chair.

[Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:
That brings us to the last item on our agenda, which is public comment. Is there anyone wishing to provide public comment? [There was no one.] With that, this meeting is adjourned [at 5:04 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Jake Matthews
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 32	C	Donna Inversin, President, Historic Virginia and Truckee Trail	Letter in support
A.B. 32	D	Donna Inversin, President, Historic Virginia and Truckee Trail	Flyer pertaining to the Historic Virginia & Truckee Trail
A.B. 117	E	Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May, Assembly District No. 42	Proposed amendment
A.B. 475	F	Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County	Proposed amendment
A.B. 475	G	Reva Crump, Private Citizen	Letter in opposition