MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR

Eighty-third Session
April 30, 2025

The Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Julie Pazina at 8:04 a.m. on Wednesday, April 30, 2025, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 5 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit A is the agenda. Exhibit B is the attendance roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Julie Pazina, Chair
Senator Skip Daly, Vice Chair
Senator Melanie Scheible
Senator Edgar Flores
Senator John Ellison
Senator Lori Rogich
Senator John C. Steinbeck

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Roberta Lange (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Shea M. Backus, Assembly District No. 37
Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District No. 41

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Ashton, Committee Policy Analyst
Jeff Koelemay, Committee Counsel
Bryan Fernley, Committee Counsel
Madison Zajac, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jonathan Norman, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
John Sande, Nevada State Apartment Association
Cyrus Hojjaty, Local Chapter Leader, Strong Towns Las Vegas
Anahit Baghshetsyan, Nevada Policy Research Institute
Maurice Washington, Legislative Liaison, Americans for Prosperity Nevada
Jennifer Lewis, Nevada Multifamily Alliance
Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League
Mendy Elliott, Nevada Housing Coalition; Nevada Rural Housing Authority
Cassidy Wilson, Builders Association of Northen Nevada
Olivia Tanager, Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter
Connie McMullen, Senior Coalition of Washoe County
Warren Hardy, Nevada Urban Consortium
Vincent Guthreau, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties
Jill Douglass
Kimberly Johnston-Linsday
Kimberly Fergus
Lindsay Knox, Douglas County
Charles Olander, Planned Parenthood Advocates Mar Monte
Liliana Trejo Vanegas, Reproductive Freedom for All
Krystal Minera-Alvis, Communications Director, Nevada Right to Life
Jenny Cole
Melissa Clement, Executive Director, Nevada Right to Life
Theresa DeGraffenreid
Elizabeth MacMenamin, Retail Association of Nevada Chain Drug Council
Deborah Costello, Executive Director, First Choice Pregnancy Resources
Elisheba Delote
Grace Trujillo, Nevada Right to Life
Katrin Ivanoff
Jim DeGraffenreid, National Committeeman, Nevada Republican Party
Carl Maalouf
Devin Livziey, Vice Chairman, Clark County Republican Party
Janine Hansen, Nevada Families for Freedom
Karl Reinarz
Erica Nealy
Michelle Barnes
Megan Cavallero, Legislative Intern to Assemblymember Shea M. Backus

Laura Arnold, Executive Director, Board of Psychological Examiners
Spencer Flanders, Nevada Psychological Association

CHAIR PAZINA:
Our first bill hearing today will be Assembly Bill (A.B.) 280. Assembly Majority Leader Sandra Jauregui will present the bill today.

ASSEMBLY BILL 280 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to housing. (BDR 10-337)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER SANDRA JAUREGUI (Assembly District No. 41):
Housing affordability has become one of the most pressing issues in our State. This is particularly true for seniors. Many seniors live on fixed incomes derived from sources such as social security benefits, pensions or retirement savings. These income streams often do not keep pace with the rising cost of living, particularly escalating housing expenses. Many rely on social security pensions and savings that don't adjust to keep pace with soaring rental prices.

A single unexpected rent hike can mean the difference between staying in a home or facing eviction. Assembly Bill 280 can protect seniors from sudden and unaffordable rent hikes, ensuring they can allocate their limited resources to other essential needs like health care and nutrition. Studies have shown that unaffordable rent burdens force older adults to cut back on health care, food and other basic necessities—negatively affecting their overall health. Nevada is home to thousands of seniors who have worked their entire lives to contribute to our communities. Assembly Bill 280 is a crucial pilot program that seeks to provide dignity and security to Nevada's senior citizens.

This bill allows us to assess the program's effectiveness in ensuring affordability without long-term commitments while balancing industry concerns. Reasonable policies like this can coexist with a healthy rental market while protecting the most vulnerable members of our community. This pilot program will be temporary so that if challenges arise—as the opposition suggests—we can adjust or reconsider the legislation. The key is to take action now, rather than allow seniors to continue to suffer, face eviction or end up homeless.

JONATHAN NORMAN (Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers):
We can all agree that consumers deserve to know how much they've obligated themselves to pay when agreeing to rent an apartment or house. We see

tenants every day. We've had landlord tenant practices in the north, south and in rural areas. We have people who rent an apartment for, say $1,500 per month, which they budget for—only to discover the rest of the story as fees after fees are sprinkled throughout the lease, ballooning their monthly costs.

We see any number of fees: air filter fees, smoke detector and battery charge fees; valet and trash fees, vague amenity fees, television, remote control fees and fees for furnished apartments. Fees can be for mandatory cable and internet packages costing over $100 a month or for paying your rent through an online portal—paying to pay rent. There are application fees and fees for background checks for you and every potential person living in the unit, including minor children.

There are two ways consumers are impacted by fees. I have lumped them into bogus fees and deceptive fees. A bogus fee is a fee for something a landlord is already obligated to provide or shouldn't be charging for. An example would be if a landlord collects ten application fees from ten prospective tenants [for the same unit] and runs the first background check. The landlord then approves the initial tenant, rents them the unit—never runs the other nine prospective tenants' backgrounds but keeps their application fees.

Running application fees for minors who are living in the unit with their parents is not needed or necessary. This is just a bogus fee that generates income. A deceptive fee is when a landlord spreads fees out throughout the lease. A fee on page 1, a fee on page 10, a fee on page 45, a fee on page 62, a fee on the addendum and so on. This is deceptive because landlords are progressively lengthening their leases year over year. If any of you have rented an apartment in Carson City, I would not be surprised to learn that your lease was over 50 pages long.

The very essence of the bargain—the amount of money that will be paid each month is deceptive. For example, internal documents from Invitation Homes that owns over 3,000 single family homes in Clark County alone discusses this practice as "strategy," even using the term "We need to juice this hog" referencing growing fees. They were talking about bilking everyday Nevadans and were sued by the Federal Trade Commission (FTC). They settled the case for $48 million. According to the FTC complaint, Invitation Homes had imposed a lease easy fee that generated $60 million for Invitation Homes between 2021

and 2023. We believe in fairness, and businesses should be prohibited from fleecing Nevadans with bogus or hidden fees—fair is fair.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
I will now go over the different sections. Section 1 deals with the return of fees to applicants who applied for a unit but were never screened.

Section 2 adds two appendixes to the end of a lease: one outlines all fees that can be charged, and the other is a "know your rights" section. Section 3 creates the pilot rent stabilization program for seniors and those on disability with a cap of 5 percent. That is the extent of the bill.

SENATOR ELLISON:
Not everybody charges fees, ever. In the rules ... that barely ever happens unless you go into apartment complexes. I have some really, really good friends who lost everything, their rental units, everything because of COVID-19. They lost their homes and cars. They lost everything because they could not collect rent.

But even though they [the renters] were still working, receiving a salary and getting subsidies, they didn't have to pay rent. We are picking on this industry and bringing these bills against people because they own rentals. These elderly Spanish people—they lost everything. Then you get renters who tear these places to pieces—what can you do? They have nothing to fall back on, and you can't sue them. There has to be some kind of happy medium. I don't think anybody should be adding these ridiculous charges—we don't. I didn't even know apartment houses came with a TV or remote—that's ridiculous.

There's a lot of stuff in this bill, and I'm worried about other bills. Those are the ones we're really worried about, but we have got to make it fair. If you're an attorney and have changes to make, do you charge extra? Yes. If you own a store and prices go up, what do you do? You charge them. If you go to a gas station, look at the gas pumps. You're picking on just one industry—go after public housing, not everybody. Go after any kind of public housing, it's a bigger unit.

I hope we can get together and talk and look at some of these bills, but some of these people lost everything they owned because of these bills that are coming out, and I am worried about it. I am worried about older seniors. They're

probably the best landlords you ever met in your life, and they're worried about these bills. There are two sides to every story, and this isn't it.

But these people who are charging fees. I agree with you—I mean, we have rentals, and my vacancy rates are probably the lowest in the State. Why? Because not everybody works at the mines. They work in the stores, casinos and gas stations. Those are the people we want, and we take good, good care of our properties. We take good care of the people we know are at risk of losing everything they own.

We're trying to help our friends in every way we can, but they've lost everything—everything ... they are in their upper eighties, so what do they do now? They're done—I want to make sure everyone knows that not all landlords are bad. It's usually large complexes in these outfits that do the rents for them. We're talking about the little guys who are being impacted.

MR. NORMAN:
I appreciate your question and the comments about the pandemic. I think during COVID-19, there was a lot of loss for many people, whether it be the loss of property or loved ones passing away.

That era was a tragic chapter in our country's history. You can still charge fees if this bill is passed—you would simply have to disclose the fees when a potential tenant is filling out the lease agreement. In one document, you need to list all the fees you are going to charge except fees that are allowed by statute. For example, a landlord is always free to charge a 5 percent late fee. This is in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). Landlords aren't currently required to disclose a television or remote fee—that's absurd. The bill doesn't prohibit a landlord from charging those fees. We're just saying they need to disclose to the tenant every fee they will be charged for and not sprinkle fees throughout the lease in an attempt to hide them.

I am convinced that most landlords—like you or your friends—are not engaging in those kinds of deceptive practices. That portion of the bill will not impact how you conduct yourself as a landlord or, frankly, how any good landlord conducts themselves. It will target people like Invitation Homes, which owns 87,000 homes across the country. The company communicates through corporate emails about using deception to trick consumers and fleece them for

more money. [Even if this bill passes], they can still charge those absurd fees. They just have to be upfront and honest about it.

SENATOR ELLISON:
With the older and smaller people, their leases are probably half a page long. I don't know how many of them are out there, but I don't know if any of them charge a late fee. I have been in business for 40 years and have never charged a late fee on any commercial or residential rents. I'm not worried about me—I can take care of myself. But these older landlords are scared to death that more [legislative] bills are going to come out—what they will do is put everything up for sale. They're going to give tenants a 30-day notice. And that is when the problem starts. They are going to be on the street because they can't take it anymore.

This industry has been impacted so badly—I'm not talking about the big guys you are going after—I support that. I am worried about the little people. They're the ones I'm worried about. They're losing everything, and every day there's another something out there to go after. I had people call me last night in panic. There's another bill coming up, commercial versus residential. That will have a real impact. We—that's a taking. We will address that [bill] when it gets here. I'm worried about the old people [landlords] who have renters and are losing everything they have—they're not the bad guys, but they are afraid in their hearts. That's what's going on.

There is a lot of fear out there right now. I help these guys every way I can, and we do not charge seniors for electrical work. We donate everything we can to these older people because they can't afford it. I'm really worried about what is going on in the next bill that is being presented because it could impact them or shut them down—that's what they're looking at.

CHAIR PAZINA:
It sounds like, ironically, you have some common ground here. I don't think either of you are looking to charge seniors for services they have not been made aware of. Having common ground is always a positive.

SENATOR ELLISON:
Common ground but not for the big people.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
My question is on section 3. Can you go over that? I was also unsure as to why that section was not highlighted in blue to indicate the language will be changed.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
The language is not highlighted in blue because it does not change the NRS. Session law gets printed in black because it is not changing our statutes.

JEFF KOELEMAY (Committee Counsel):
Section 3 is what we typically refer to internally as a transitory provision. The duration of this program is less than two years, less than one biennium. We usually include it as a transitory provision because it's a temporary thing. We don't need to codify it in the NRS because it would have to be removed later. The language goes into the NRS as a session law and goes on the books. It's included in the codified portion of the NRS because it's a temporary program.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
You also asked about section 3, the pilot rent stabilization program which is an 18-month program. The program will last less than a biennium. I wanted to put protections in there because I wanted to create a pilot program to ensure the program would work before trying to make it permanent. If the program doesn't work, it would automatically cease to exist before the next legislative session. I also don't want to have senior leases not renewed, resulting in a negative impact on seniors—not being able to do anything about it before the next legislative session. That's why I included a hard end date [on the bill]. After the last interim, I toured the City of Las Vegas Corridor. It was brought to our attention that the population of people there was growing, and they were mostly seniors on fixed incomes who could not keep up with the cost of their rent.

SENATOR ROGICH:
A very quick question. Why is a senior designated as someone over the age of 62? For instance, I will be 62 in two years and don’t feel like a senior, but under the language of section 21, section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (b), subparagraph (1), I would qualify as a senior citizen. Why 62?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
Nor do you look like one. There was a consortium of stakeholders who worked on this bill for 18 months after the 2021 Legislative Session and this age is what was agreed on. This bill is a duplicate of the bill we brought forward during the 2023 Legislative Session—with some slight changes. We took out the real property transfer tax as it would have had a huge fiscal impact on the State. That age was what was agreed upon between the various stakeholders who worked for legal aid, the realtors, Nevada mortgage lenders and other partners. There were many partners at the table, and they reached a consensus on that age.

SENATOR DALY:
Are you tying the qualifying age of 62 to social security? I believe 62 is the earliest age to take social security—the bill matches the two [ages] up, at least using that logic.

CHAIR PAZINA:
We will hear testimony in support or in opposition to this bill. Please remember the time limits of testimony.

JOHN SANDE (Nevada State Apartment Association):
Although we appreciate Assemblymember Jauregui's passion for rental issues, we do have some concerns with this bill but not about the disclosure of fees—we actually supported similar legislation that was proposed last session. I am here to express concern on the section involving rent control. While rent control aims to make housing more affordable, extensive economic research has found that over time, it often leads to reduced affordability, fuels gentrification and creates negative spillovers in surrounding neighborhoods. A study by the Brookings Institute found that rent control may provide short term relief for current tenants but decreases affordability and contributes to gentrification in the long run. Rent control can lead to a decrease in the quality and quantity of available housing.

Landlords facing capital revenues may also be less inclined to invest in property maintenance, resulting in deteriorating housing conditions. A comprehensive study highlighted that rent control often leads to reduced housing quality due to landlords diminished incentives for upkeep. Rent control policies can discourage new housing developments and exacerbate housing shortages.

After strict rent control measures were implemented in Montgomery County, Maryland, multifamily property transactions decreased by 13 percent in the first three quarters of 2024 compared to the same period in 2023—indicating reduced investment in housing. In light of these findings, it's critical to consider alternative solutions to addressing housing affordability without the adverse effects associated with rent control. Policies that promote increased housing supply [and] solutions like incentivizing new construction and reducing regulatory barriers may offer more sustainable outcomes for our community—the Majority Leader has engaged in efforts to increase housing supply. We have concerns about this effort as it relates to rent control. I will also point out this is an incredibly narrow pilot program.

SENATOR PAZINA:
I want to clarify that A.B. 280 is only a pilot program.

CYRUS HOJJATY (Local Chapter Leader, Strong Towns Las Vegas):
I echo the comments just made by the previous speaker and yield my remaining time to the next speaker.

ANAHIT BAGHSHETSYAN (Nevada Policy Research Institute):
We oppose A.B. 280. The reason is not the disclosure of fees—it's the rent control pilot program. We oppose rent control even in limited forms and scope as it creates serious long-term consequences for Nevada's housing market. Limiting rent increases to 5 percent for a subset of tenants may offer short-term relief for retirees. But it also distorts the price signals that allow the housing supply to adjust to the rising prices and rising demand.

Because of the vague criteria, this program may attract retirees who can well afford rent increases. This kind of restriction discourages new construction and does not incentivize investment in existing rental properties—in a State where housing availability is already lagging behind the population growth. The impact will be huge on small landlords. As Senator Ellison mentioned earlier, many of these individuals rely solely on rental income to maintain their everyday activities. Blanket caps on rent, even if temporary or segmented, will have a negative impact on small landlords.

It could also have a chilling effect on the entire housing ecosystem and signal to future landlords that rent controls are on the table and something the Legislature is considering for the long term. For these reasons, we oppose this bill.

MAURICE WASHINGTON (Legislative Liaison, Americans for Prosperity):
We oppose A.B. 280 which requires landlords to return application fees collected by prospective tenants under certain conditions, prohibits charging application fees for minors, mandates that written agreements for dwelling units include fees and requires a lease to have a tenant's rights section.

This bill also makes it illegal to charge tenants specific fees and temporarily prevents landlords from raising rent for existing tenants by more than a specific amount. We oppose A.B. 280.

CHAIR PAZINA:
The committee received a letter in opposition (Exhibit C) from Ron M. Aryel. I will close the hearing on A.B. 280 and open the bill hearing on A.B. 241.

ASSEMBLY BILL 241 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to housing. (BDR 22-65)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER SANDRA JAUREGUI (Assembly District No. 41):
Nevada is facing a severe housing shortage which has led to skyrocketing rents and home prices. It has become increasingly difficult for working families and young professionals and retirees to find affordable housing. According to the "Housing Market and Land Availability Analysis" done by Applied Analysis [dated April 7, 2022] through the Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association, we have approximately eight years of land to build on before land runs out and we aren't even in Southern Nevada.

Not only do we have a housing supply shortage—we also have a land shortage. Through my work on housing issues, there isn't a one-size-fits-all solution to solving the affordability and housing epidemic. This is why I'm working on various bills to protect senior citizens. A resolution urging Congress to pass Senator Catherine Cortez Mastos's Clark County Lands Bill and A.B. 241 will open up more buildable land for multifamily dwellings in run-down, underutilized retail and commercial lots.

Data shows that Nevada's workforce lives mainly in apartments as they are more attainable given our tight supply. Some quick facts—first, Las Vegas rents have surged by over 40 percent in the past five years. Second, Reno has also experienced a notable increase in rental prices. In 2020, the average monthly

apartment rent in Reno/Sparks was approximately $1,680. As of February 2025, the average rent for an apartment in Reno was $1,831. Lastly, nearly one in four Nevada renters spends more than 50 percent of their income on housing, placing them at risk of financial instability.

To combat this national housing supply shortage, state and local governments in cities and counties larger and smaller than ours are mandating changes to their zoning laws. In 2023, Montana lawmakers passed a suite of bills known as the Montana Miracle. The bills included the Land Use Planning Act requiring various changes to local planning and zoning processes. Another Montana law, based on Montana Senate Bill 323, required municipalities of a certain population to allow duplexes in single-family zones.

A third Montana Senate Bill, 528, required all cities to allow accessory dwelling units, and a companion Montana Senate Bill 245 required local Montana governments with a population of 5,000 or more to allow mixed-use and multiple-unit dwellings in commercial areas. Thus, A.B. 241 was born.

I immediately thought of the old run-down, vacant and abandoned Kmart in Spring Mountain on Rainbow Street and thought it would be a great opportunity to develop multifamily housing near shopping and transportation. Rezoning commercial property for multifamily housing is a practical and immediate solution to increase housing supply and address affordability issues. There are benefits to infill development. Many commercial properties, particularly aging strip malls and vacant office buildings, are underutilized. Repurposing them for housing makes better use of existing infrastructure. Building homes closer to jobs, schools and public transit reduces commute times, lowers greenhouse gas emissions and decreases urban sprawl. I will turn this presentation over to Jennifer Lewis with the Nevada Multifamily Alliance. They are a group of six apartment developers who have built, owned and now manage more than 20,000 units across Nevada.

Two friendly amendments have been also submitted. The first amendment (Exhibit D) from Washoe and Douglas Counties would exclude areas around the Tahoe Basin area. The second amendment (Exhibit E) from Clark County would exclude areas around airports.

JENNIFER LEWIS (Nevada Multifamily Alliance):
We are pleased to support A.B. 241. Zoning reform seems like a big topic because land use underpins our entire economy whether it touches our housing, current and future residents or growing our economy further. Currently, 66 percent of Nevada residents live in single-family units, and 21.4 percent live in complexes containing over five units. This pattern is no longer sustainable with Nevada's land constraints. In 2023, the American Planning Association tracked at least 11 state legislatures involved in reworking zoning laws. The housing crisis impacts every part of our State from education, employment and future growth; this is a national crisis.

This is a redevelopment and infill bill—all of us in the room see underutilized or abandoned retail or vacant commercial corners that are not likely to develop. These are often well-located parcels with good transportation and other infrastructure, but current use is no longer economically viable. The retail and office landscape has changed significantly since the pre-COVID-19 era, and many retailers have closed up shop.

We see empty buildings in Carson City on College Parkway, or Spring Mountain [Road and] Rainbow Street [Boulevard in Las Vegas], and Green Valley and Warm Springs—even across the street from here. In 2024, the Glenn Research Center conducted a study on housing affordability. The goal was to create a list of plausible policy solutions to address the supply redevelopment and pursue zoning reform. We are at the top of the list of suggestions. Last year, the Regional Transportation Commission [of Southern Nevada] did a study that found 82,000 acres of underutilized acreage in the [Las Vegas] Valley. This bill provides a way to offer up middle and smaller sized— parcels that can sustain duplexes or triplexes. We are running out of land and need to grow in newer, more efficient ways.

Multifamily houses such as apartments, townhomes, condos or similar products are workforce housing. In response to questions I have received—not every commercial site is appropriate for multifamily use. Land use should always be guided by health, safety and welfare. There are areas where adjacent uses may be problematic—heavy manufacturing, hazardous storage, airport environments— adjacency to military facilities and other considerations are also necessary. I anticipate that the scale and massing of multifamily projects would also be important but is something best dealt with by ordinance. I support A.B. 41 [A.B. 241], which will add to our housing supply.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
I also want the committee to know there are changes coming to the bill. One of the changes is that the implementation date of October 1, 2026, be moved up. We are considering moving the date to January or February 2025 [*sic*]. That will be added to section 1. This will allow each governing body to adopt an ordinance. We want to move up the implementation date to give governing bodies plenty of time to put the bill in use before the next legislative session. That way, we can see if it [the legislation] is working. I am also working with the Urban Consortium on changing some of the language. They have provided me with the language, but I haven't had the opportunity to look at it. I wanted to present the bill as is but may change some of the language to make it more of a conditional use permit.

CHAIR PAZINA:
Make sure to please read these two amendments, Exhibit D and Exhibit E.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:
I have moved away from the text of the bill—section 1, subsection 1 where it refers to a "governing body." I assume that refers to a governing body as defined in NRS 278.015. Are we talking about every single city council and county commission? Where do these commissions overlap? Would the City of Mesquite and the Clark County Commission both have to submit these plans?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
It would be whoever has jurisdiction over the zoning of the commercial property, but Ms. Lewis can better answer the question.

MS. LEWIS:
Typically, only one entity has controlling interest for zoning. I don't want to speak out of turn on Mesquite or Northern Nevada because I don't know as much about them. Typically, you're submitting plans to Clark County versus Henderson, North Las Vegas or the City of Las Vegas. I can't remember if Mesquite is incorporated or a part of Clark County. You would just submit to the Clark County Planning Commission.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:
That would require applying for one permit. As I'm reading the bill, it requires the governing body itself to implement an ordinance. Would the City of

Mesquite need an ordinance? Would the City of Las Vegas, the City of North Las Vegas and Clark County all need ordinances?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
Clark County ordinances would apply to all properties that are under their jurisdiction like unincorporated Clark County. The City of Las Vegas ordinances would apply to properties that are within the City of Las Vegas but also within Clark County—their ordinances would apply.

SENATOR ELLISON:
Are you aware that a lot of the cities and counties now have multiple use [permits] on commercial and residential properties? Look at the old places in cities and towns. In Las Vegas, look at places where there's a store below an apartment; it's multiuse, and I see them everywhere. Would this law change this? It's either going to be commercial or residential, but there's so many places that are multiuse in every city and county—Nevada has a lot of them.

Also, under section 11, the ordinance authorizes a rider for multiple family housing. Isn't that already on the books in almost every county? Look at the *Las Vegas Downtown Redevelopment Agency v. Pappas, City of*, 119 Nev. 429, 76 P.3d 1 (2003). They lived in an upstairs apartment in Las Vegas and had a business downstairs. They used eminent domain laws to throw her out, and it took years and years and years to settle the case. During that time, she lost her business, her home—she lost everything in one shot. I want to make sure that we don't get into some of these units because laws are already on the books. All the new commercial [zones] are commercial, and the residential [zones] are residential, but there's still stuff on the books that relate to multiuse properties.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
This bill does not intend to change that. This bill allows commercial buildings to be zoned as mixed use. It's not changing residential use to multifamily or mixed use. The bill allows any zoned commercial property to be used for multifamily and mixed use where you have a store on the first floor and residential on top.

SENATOR ELLISON:
I want to ensure that counties … it's already on the books—there's multiple use now in a lot of counties. This bill is going to put cities within the counties through a lot of work because a lot of them [these laws] are already on the books.

SENATOR DALY:
I don't think the State should get involved with local land use policies. I know Northern Nevada through my previous work with the union. I've been to many planning commission and city council meetings, and you must complete multiple steps for zoning changes. I understand the desire to streamline that a little bit, but A.B. 241 lacks a definition of "mixed use." We are throwing terms around because somebody mentioned multiuse and mixed use, but mixed use is not defined in A.B. 241. At the very least, we need to allow the local governments to stick with their own definitions.

I'm concerned that some developers will say, "Hey, we are doing multifamily, we are doing apartments, we asked for the zoning change, and here we go." Other people will say, "I really want to do this—I'm going to put in a couple of houses or residences," but then the zoning has been changed. I'm just not sure what can of worms we'll be opening. If you have a zoning change, you go through the special use permit process. Have there been any multifamily or mixed-use projects that have gone through the special use project process in the last three to five years and were denied? Is the current process working?

MS. LEWIS:
Historically, if you rezone multifamily to commercial use, you would request and be approved for a zone change. Most of the time, you would submit a comprehensive plan and then request a zone change. The process could take between three months to three years. It depends on the entity, the neighbors and a lot of other variables. There are some [plans] that have been pending for months and months and months. It depends on the process. I also want to clarify something Senator Ellison touched on.

In the City of Las Vegas, for example, they have form-based codes. You're really dealing more with the intensity of use versus actual use. The zoning is always based on health, safety and welfare. You are basing zoning on how it will impact the neighborhood. There are different traffic impacts on a retail center versus apartments, but single family and offices reflect more intensive uses. When discussing form-based codes, it's based on density. The form-based code is a really interesting idea because you're worrying about the density and not so much about the mass. If that doesn't answer your question, I'm willing to try again.

SENATOR DALY:
I'll wait to hear from the counties because Ms. Lewis did not answer my question. Again, have any special use permits been denied in the last five years?

She did answer how local governments determine land use planning and 50-year master plan uses. They study the master plan and adjust them every ten years or so. They try to balance the land use in residential areas. They see if the current plan meets criteria they've set up and plan a certain number of commercial uses so there are amenities—facilities, stores, etcetera, and if these types of things are relatively close.

When you think of a master planned community—they have housing and commercial zones. It upsets people—the local governments do long-term master planning for the long term and are better suited at doing this stuff. This bill just sticks our hand in their business and tells them we are changing their plans. If I have a master planned community in Somerset or Northern Nevada, and their plan is to have so much residential and so much commercial etcetera, and now that can be changed .... and the developer says "yeah, we're not having commercial here, we're putting in another set of condos or whatever"—now everybody's got to drive another 15 miles to go to the grocery store because that area is not available for commercial anymore. I'm dubious about going forward with some of this stuff.

You mentioned Montana. Nevada is a lot like Montana in some ways, but the biggest city in Montana is Billings with a population of 123,000. Montana's capital has a population of only 34,000 people. City, land use planning and other various other things are not comparable at all.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
I respect your opinion, but Montana is not the only state that has changed zoning laws. Some of our neighboring states have also changed their laws because we are all in a housing epidemic. It is our responsibility to help address housing—not just leave it to the local governments. We've had constituents throughout the State who are asking us to do something about the affordability issue. This solution can help bring affordability by increasing supply. The more supply we have, the more that the price will go down. It's supply and demand.

This bill is not the only tool in the toolbox we can use to fix the affordable housing situation. We have to look at this from a holistic approach and use

every tool in the toolbox. It is our responsibility as the Assembly and Senate to work on housing issues.

SENATOR DALY:
We are missing elements. Developers want to develop land. They will now be able to get into otherwise commercial areas and develop for the highest and best use. I have seen local government say, "Hey, what is the mix of housing you're going to have"—if they only want to build high-end condos, which won't help with affordability. Certain people are going to be taken care of—that's the highest best use. The highest best use is to get the highest rent return. They are not going to develop anywhere unless they can get the highest rent.

Local governments say they want more affordable, reasonably priced housing. They don't get into low income [housing] because that's all subsidized by the federal government under completely different rules. But they do say, "Hey, you have to have a higher density in this area, lower density in others"—whatever; most developers will work with them on that. It's all part of the zoning change process, and it upsets the element.

If you're saying this bill will allow more units because it will affect affordability, we are missing certain elements to hit that target. If I'm a developer, I would want to develop to the highest best use. I have new areas I can go into now. I would take all the zoning stuff I'm required to do now and try to negotiate with the government to get more affordability or a better housing mix.

All that is gone. I can develop the highest special use, and I won't care a lick about affordability. I will just try to get the best rent return I can. There are elements missing in A.B. 241. I have one final comment, which Ms. Lewis did speak to it directly. The processes around land use and zoning changes on the master plan are what people expect when they buy in an area. They expect that various things will be zoned commercial, and we hope it's developed for these types of things. Every time there is a zoning change, it has to go through the process—the Clark County Planning Commission in Clark County or the Northern Nevada Regional Planning Board in Northern Nevada.

If a county or city council denies the use permit, it goes back to the requester and that's when the public has input on what their community is going to look like. This process short-circuits the State sticking their hand in and telling the

local governments that they don't know what they're doing, and we know better than them. It's a mistake for us to do that.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
I want all commercial property to be used for mixed use and multifamily use, but we still want to give local governments some discretion. These are some of the conversations we've had—what should be built and where. What type of use? How tall? How big should the setbacks be? We still want to give them that discretion. I do want every commercially zoned property to be used for mixed use and multifamily. Developers will build to what is the highest and best use, but they will also build what is going to sell or be rentable.

They're not going to put in luxury condos on the Kmart property on Spring Mountain and Rainbow Street—they're not going to do that. It's a balancing act; we're opening up available parcels where we can build and increase [housing] inventory. I have not yet reviewed the amended language, but we are still looking at ways to give local governments discretion on what types of multifamily or mixed-use properties can be built.

SENATOR DALY:
They will know that every property can be used for commercial mixed use and multifamily. I think we just need a little language to give them some discretion, not too much because you don't want them playing games either.

I agree with the amendments carving out Tahoe Basin and airport regions. The Tahoe Basin is a whole other game. I think we need a little wiggle room so their definition of "mixed use" is used. You also touched on the public input part, but that's why it's our responsibility. I've had my constituents blow up my phone, send emails and knock on my doors because an apartment complex is being built next to our subdivision of single-family residences. They want me to call the county commissioner and put an end to it.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
Everyone in our state deserves affordable housing to live in. Unfortunately, NIMBYism is real, and I think that some of our responsibility is to address that. Everyone deserves housing, and we need multifamily housing because that's where Nevada's workforce lives.

SENATOR ROGICH:
I want to reconfirm that the intent of A.B. 241 is to repurpose vacant commercial properties and increase housing.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
That's correct. It's been done in other areas, not just Montana. It's been done in Milwaukee and New York with great success—they've converted vacant malls into multiunit apartments for long-term living. That's the intent of A.B. 241. In my district, there are little side streets that feed off Las Vegas Boulevard. They are not directly on Las Vegas Boulevard, or they would automatically be eligible for conversion to multifamily housing. There are little side streets that feed into run-down strip malls with maybe one liquor store open and everything else vacant.

CHAIR PAZINA:
We will now hear testimony in support of A.B. 241. Please keep testimony to 2 minutes or less with 20 minutes allotted for each side.

CHRISTI CABRERA-GEORGESON (Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League):
We support A.B. 241 which takes an essential step to encouraging infill development across the State.

Recent polling confirms that over 75 percent of Nevadans support using existing underutilized land and infill development for housing rather than selling off our treasured public lands. Infill offers numerous environmental benefits. It reduces urban sprawl, preserves natural landscapes, lowers emissions and reduces traffic congestion. We urge the committee's support.

MR. SANDE:
Nevada is facing a serious housing shortage. More than half of renters are spending over 30 percent of their income on rent. The single most effective way to reduce housing costs is to increase the housing supply. One of our association attorneys says there's not a single issue between landlords and tenants that can't be solved by doubling the housing supply. He means that by doubling the housing supply, our costs will come down, [and we] provide more competition and make landlords compete with one another for tenants. It will make our housing situation better which is what this bill is seeking to do; increase our housing supply. This type of policy does not just improve

affordability—it helps revitalize unused commercial areas and supports walkable vibrant communities.

Assembly Bill 241 is a smart land use policy with immediate long-term benefits. I recall a similar project in northern Reno. There was an empty Kmart up there, and some young developers built a beautiful apartment complex on that property. When I envisioned this bill, I envisioned projects like that one. They will revitalize areas of the community, especially nonproductive commercial sites. We would urge you to support this bill.

MENDY ELLIOTT (Nevada Housing Coalition, Nevada Rural Housing Authority):
We want to thank the bill sponsors for bringing this bill, and we agree with everything Mr. Sande just said. We support A.B. 241.

CASSIDY WILSON (Builders Association of Northen Nevada):
Our Association was founded in 1956 and represents more than 700 companies and advocates on issues affecting residential development and home building across Northern Nevada. The Association is in strong support of A.B. 241. We all share a common concern—the high cost of housing in Nevada and the barrier it creates for individuals and families who aspire to homeownership. These prices are not arbitrary. They are the result of basic economics, high demand and little supply.

In a bipartisan effort last session, the Legislature passed A.B. No. 213 of the 82nd Session, led by Majority Leader Jauregui, which affirmed that the consistent and robust supply of housing is an important factor. The affordability of housing addressed in A.B. 241 builds directly on that principle. This bill will help streamline the process and unlock new opportunities for housing development, particularly in multifamily housing. Multifamily units are a critical component of our housing supply. They offer an affordable and attainable path for home ownership, especially for first time homebuyers and working families. They also create housing stability and a foundation to build a quality home: the cornerstone of financial security for many Nevadans. We want to thank Majority Leader Jauregui for continuing to champion supply and bringing forth solutions for our housing crisis.

MR. HOJJATY:
We promote alternative planning ideas from the status quo of what we've had for decades—something more traditional. We promote transit-oriented mixed

use, which is what A.B. 241 represents. This type of use is more walkable and bikeable. We will also echo the previous comments. We want to ensure that street design matters. We want to ensure that new development is surrounded by streets where people can walk and get around by bicycle. We're excited that infill development in housing is being promoted. We do not want codes and regulations getting in the way, making it more and more difficult to build affordable housing. We hope this bill passes, shakes things up, and we can't wait to get started.

OLIVIA TANAGER (Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter):
We strongly support A.B. 241 and appreciate the bill sponsor bringing it forward. As many of you probably know, our organization has been fighting urban sprawl for a long time all across Nevada. We believe that infill development is environmentally preferable to urban sprawl in Nevada. It makes more efficient use of land and existing infrastructure, and reduces the need to extend roads, utilities and public services into undeveloped desert areas.

There's been a renewed focus on using public lands for housing. A recent study concluded there are almost 80,000 acres in the Las Vegas Valley that could be used for infill. That's a substantial amount of land we could still use in the footprint of our existing urban areas. These are places where public transit already runs—nearby places where we already have utility infrastructure, roads, and places that are close to people's work, schools, grocery stores and things like that. Our folk can then either walk or use public transportation, which is critical for limited or diminishing biodiversity in the State. It also reduces vehicles and vehicle miles traveled significantly. Given concerns associated with sprawl, we support these efforts. This bill was well-thought-out, and we encourage the committee to support it.

CONNIE MCMULLEN (Senior Coalition of Washoe County):
We support A.B. 241 because it will enable older adults to age in place. It's critical that this occur, and locally, there will be discussion. There must be recognition that people need to remain in their community. It [housing] can't only be for people who have upper incomes. There's been a certain amount of greed in our communities, and it's about time they make room for younger people and older adults. May is the Older Americans Month. Please support A.B. 241. I also want to recognize A.B. 280.

I was not able to get on the phone when that bill was heard, but we also support that bill. We also support the sponsors of this bill—her efforts and recognition that older Americans suffering right now.

SENATOR PAZINA:
We will move to testimony in opposition of A.B. 241. Please remember that all opposition testimony will be kept at 20 minutes.

WARREN HARDY (Nevada Urban Consortium):
I want to reference and address the question Senator Scheible asked—Mesquite is an incorporated city. The intent of this legislation is that the city or county that manages zoning would handle this. If it's not clear in the legislation, we probably need to address that. For Clark County, the provisions of A.B. 241 would only apply to unincorporated portions of Clark County. The other areas would fall under the jurisdiction of their cities.

I am here under the rules of the committee. We've had some very fruitful conversations with the Majority Leader, and I appreciate her willingness to work with us to address our concerns. I'm a little freaked out this session about how much I am agreeing with Senator Daly, but I think some of his comments reflect the way we all feel. As a former [Senator] member, I would never question the ability of this body to engage in any policy matter they choose to engage in. This legislation would streamline both the process and system.

We are in full support of mixed-use and multifamily projects, particularly when it comes to infill. This bill would allow infill on vacant property which gives us some heartburn—but it's such a powerful tool for infill. We are aggressively moving in that direction, so we can provide for that. We are also working with the sponsor on an amendment that would get at the issue Senator Daly brought up—to have the ability to set some standards on the land.

We're also working to clarify and make clear that this legislation will not require a zoning change—a much longer process. It [infill] would be a permitted use under commercial zoning. The bill does not allow industrial [infill], but it would be permitted under commercial use which would streamline the process. Currently, you would have to apply for a special use permit to do infill on commercial zoning. This bill would eliminate the need to apply for a special use permit as long as you meet the standards in the ordinance. That is our intent.

We look forward to finalizing that amendment and moving forward so we can support A.B. 241.

VINCENT GUTHREAU (Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties):
I am here on behalf of all 17 of our member counties. I echo that we are here under the rules of the committee. We want to thank the Majority Leader for working on the two amendments she considers friendly—including the carveout for the Clark County Airport, the Harry Reid International Airport and the Lake Tahoe Basin. We appreciate her acceptance of those two amendments. Our members understand and share the goal of the sponsor's bill for infill and mixed use.

We believe that there's already a process that accomplishes this goal. Streamlining the process is not the worst thing, but we need to include some provisions to allow for our members to reflect the unique characteristics of each of their communities. Reflecting on what the previous testifier said, there are some amendments floating around out there. The bill sponsor also mentioned the amendments would move us to a different position—I want to put that on the record for our county members. There was also a question around data. I have information from Clark County that they have not denied an application for a multifamily project since 2022.

CHAIR PAZINA:
I want to thank Mr. Guthreau and Mr. Hardy for answering some of the questions that have been asked.

JILL DOUGLASS:
I am speaking as a concerned citizen. I stand in opposition to A.B. 241. I previously testified against this bill when it was in the Assembly. This is government overreach, even though it's well intended. I am concerned about the bill's impact on existing zoning laws and community planning. State-mandated changes may override local control, ignore the voices of affected citizens and lead to developments that are inconsistent with community character or infrastructure capacity. I am also concerned about potential strain on public services and resources resulting from increased population density in areas originally designated for commercial use. Local governments and citizens affected by the bill should be engaged and involved in preserving local autonomy and community integrity—not the state government. Please vote no on A.B. 241.

KIMBERLY JOHNSTON-LINSDAY:
I want to thank Senator Daly for his questions and points that he made—I respect that. I also want to ditto Jill Douglas—that's all.

SENATOR PAZINA:
We always appreciate when members of the public come and speak, and we thank you for being here today.

KIMBERLY FERGUS:
I want to thank Senator Daly for asking all the questions I had written down, but I'm against these mandates. Cities and counties approve multifamily housing by right. I don't like it when the public can't voice their opinion. This [bill] voids existing local zoning ordinances and contains an unfunded mandate. It fails as a housing solution, and you guys are saying this will fix our housing situation and it doesn't build a single unit. There's no affordability requirement, no funding included, and the bill removes the local voice. It's a one-size-fits-all approach. Bottom line—A.B. 241 is a land use overreach and not a housing fix. Nobody has ever mentioned our housing shortage, but the reason we have a housing shortage is because of interest rates.

When they raised interest rates from 2 percent to 6 and and 7 percent—that's when housing became impossible. But there's still people building, building, building, I'm all for multiuse on vacant lands and stuff like that. These bills need a lot of amendments, and realtors should also be asked their opinions on this bill. I urge you to vote no on A.B. 241.

LINDSAY KNOX (Douglas County):
We are neutral on A.B. 241 and want to thank the committee for accepting our amendment on the Lake Tahoe exclusion.

SENATOR PAZINA:
I will close the hearing on A.B. 241 and open the hearing on A.B. 411.

ASSEMBLY BILL 411: Revises provisions relating to prescription drugs. (BDR 54-1100)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER SANDRA JAUREGUI (Assembly District No. 41):
Assembly Bill 411 is a simple, powerful step toward privacy, dignity and security for those who provide essential reproductive care. This bill allows

prescription labels to display the name of the healthcare practice, rather than the healthcare provider for prescription medications like mifepristone and misoprostol. These medications are used for medicated abortion and miscarriage management.

This bill is not merely a policy proposal. It's a necessary step to ensure that our healthcare providers can offer essential services without fear. In recent years, there has been a concerted effort in various states to restrict access to abortion services, particularly targeting medication abortions which account for approximately 63 percent of all abortions in the United States. Many states, including Texas and Louisiana, have enacted laws that ban abortion after a certain gestational period and impose severe penalties on healthcare providers who prescribe these inducing medications. These restrictive measures have created a climate of fear among healthcare practitioners—discouraging them from providing necessary care and consequently limiting access for patients seeking safe and legal reproductive care.

Nevada is not alone in recognizing the need for protective legislation. Several states have already enacted shield laws to protect providers and patients from out-of-state investigations and prosecutions. As of April 2024, 17 states and Washington, D.C., have similar statues on the books: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Vermont and Washington State. New York was the first state to pass a law expanding its shield laws to protect the name of the healthcare provider by omitting it from the prescription bottle if requested.

Since New York implemented legislation, other states have introduced similar expansions to their shield law, including Illinois and Colorado. These laws serve as a testament to the growing recognition of the need to protect reproductive healthcare services and those who provide them. I will walk the committee through the bill.

The bill changes NRS 639.2801, section 1, subsection 3 so that upon the request of the prescribing practitioner, the label for a prescription for mifepristone or misoprostol must instead include the name of the healthcare practice. This bill does not change the law on medication abortion in Nevada, does not change who can prescribe it and does not change patient rights. It

ensures that healthcare providers can do their jobs without fear, and patients can receive the care they need without stigma or obstruction.

I am working on an amendment with Elizabeth MacMenamin—extending protections similar to those we have extended in previous sessions for physicians to protect them from criminal penalties. This bill would extend the same protections to pharmacists and pharmacies. If they won't be including the name of the physician on the label, we want to ensure they are protected from any criminal penalties.

We think this inclusion is necessary because the State of Louisiana has classified these two drugs as controlled substances, so they are federally regulated. I want to ensure that pharmacists have the same protections as physicians so they can also fulfill their prescriptions and fulfill their obligations without fear.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:
My questions are more like comments, but I want to see if there's anything I'm missing here. I recently had an online telehealth appointment with a doctor when I had a cold and was prescribed an antibiotic. When I picked up the prescription from the pharmacy, the name on the label wasn't the provider I met with. Some health organizations utilize a network of doctors, so the provider I met with may not have been the person who signed my prescription. Could that happen with these types of prescriptions where the prescribing doctor or person who uses their prescription pad might not be the provider who initially met with the patient?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
I don't know if that happens when mifepristone or misoprostol are prescribed. I don't know if the name on the prescription has to be the name of the doctor who saw the patient.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:
I'm not sure if the prescription must be written by the same prescribing doctor you meet with. I hope I didn't just tell on my insurance company because it wasn't a big deal to me. It made sense—I get it. The practice probably met with 35 other people that day and has a system of checks and balances in place. I did get my antibiotics, and I'm better now.

Is there already a law to require the name of the prescribing doctor or physician? The physical medication bottle is a little bit antiquated because we have been dispensing medicine that way for probably 100 years—since prescriptions were carried by horseback from one provider to another to be filled. We do prescribe more online now, and with Google, you can look up the name and phone number of a provider more easily. It's far less important now to have a person's name on a prescription label when there are so many other ways to get in contact with your healthcare provider or for your pharmacy to get in contact with them or the insurance company. We're not really losing out on any kind of crucial healthcare information by removing names from labels.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
I agree. The name of the prescribing physician and their contact information still have to be on the prescription itself. We're just trying to protect the writer of the prescription by removing their information and adding the clinic's information to the prescription bottle label.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:
I have one more comment because it just made me think of an incredibly sad situation—I have seen similar situations in my career working with survivors of domestic violence.

A lot of domestic violence survivors who are seeking a medication abortion may bring the prescription bottle back to their home. Being able to protect the person who provided them with that crucial health care from someone who's abusive is worth doing.

CHAIR PAZINA:
I want to confirm that the contact information on the label would still be available.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
In subsection 1, the name of the prescribing practitioner and the person who prescribed the drug must be removed, but the name of the clinic and the clinic contact information would still be on there—in place of the prescribing physician's information.

SENATOR ELLISON:
If you have a pharmacy that has a question about a prescription, wouldn't they want to know the exact doctor who prescribed the medication? Shouldn't that be on the prescription bottle or something? Would they be able to contact the doctor?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
Nothing would change on the actual physical prescription that gets sent electronically or through a handwritten prescription pad. The physician's contact information and name are still required to be on that prescription. We are only asking that it be removed upon request from the actual label on the prescription bottle—if requested.

CHAIR PAZINA:
We have a number of people who'd like to speak on this particular bill, and each side will be allowed 20 minutes of testimony. Although you absolutely do have two minutes to speak, someone else might not get an opportunity in those 20 minutes. We will hear testimony in support of A.B. 411.

CHARLES OLANDER (Planned Parenthood Advocates Mar Monte):
Assembly Bill 411 is a simple bill that will protect healthcare providers from harassment. It will also preserve safe, legal access to care for patients across Nevada. With increased threats to providers nationwide. It's important to protect the providers who ensure that Nevadans can access the full spectrum of reproductive care, including abortion. I urge you to support A.B. 411.

LILIANA TREJO VANEGAS (Reproductive Freedom for All):
I am testifying today in support of A.B. 411. Abortion is health care, and no medical provider or patient should ever fear that their privacy or safety is at risk when seeking and providing this life saving care. I urge the committee to vote in favor of this bill.

CHAIR PAZINA
We will now open testimony in opposition of A.B. 411. I can see from the sign-in sheets that there are many people who want to testify, but please be aware of the 20-minute time limitation.

KRYSTAL MINERA-ALVIS (Communications Director, Nevada Right to Life):
We urge you to vote no on A.B. 411. It's always said that abortion should be a decision between a woman and her doctor. If A.B. 411 is passed, we won't even know who the doctor is. This lack of transparency creates serious risks, leaving patients vulnerable in emergencies when proper medical oversight is needed.

This week, the largest known study of the abortion pill conducted by the Ethics and Public Policy Center was released. The Center analyzed over 865,000 mifepristone abortions between 2017 and 2023, which revealed troubling data. Nearly 11 percent of women experience sepsis infection, hemorrhaging or another serious adverse event within 45 days after taking mifepristone—the abortion pills own black box warning states that one in 25 women will end up in the emergency room. This new study updates prior numbers and reflect the number of women suffering a serious adverse event is actually one in every ten.

These findings demonstrate that the real-world dangers of the abortion pill are far more severe than previously reported. Serious adverse events occur at a rate of at least 22 times higher than the clinical trial figure of less than one-half of 1 percent. Despite these risks, A.B. 411 removes physician accountability by eliminating the prescribing doctor's name from abortion pill labels. This would protect doctors—not patients—for every prescription drug, including those with a high dosage.

Tylenol requires physician identification for oversight and responsibility. Why should a prescription with life-altering consequences be exempt without clear accountability. Patients facing complications such as excessive bleeding or infection are left without critical medical information in emergencies where seconds matter—doctors are shielded while patients and families scramble for answers. By removing safeguards, this bill makes abortion providers untouchable and provides them legal protection. For these reasons, I urge you to vote no on A.B. 411.

JENNY COLE:
I have been a licensed nurse practitioner for 15 years. I prescribed medications in accordance with all requirements of the State Board of Pharmacy and federal Drug Enforcement [Administration] agency. I am authorized to prescribe medications because of my compliance with the Board's licensing regulations. I

prescribe medication after establishing the necessary prescriber-patient relationship. My patients are not prescribed medications from the healthcare practice where I'm employed as my healthcare practice is not a prescribing entity.

I have experienced negligent abortion pill practices firsthand. One woman came to our clinic after receiving her prescription through an email request—without even a video appointment or voice call. After taking the first medication in the two-step process, she had questions and needed guidance, but there was nobody she could call—no provider to follow up with. If Nevada allows mifepristone and misoprostol to be provided to women without full transparency and accountability, she is not being cared for properly, and the potential for negative outcomes increases.

I ask that you carefully consider who will assume legal consequences for harm. The only reason a provider would hide their name from any prescription is to remove themselves from liability and the potential of a negative outcome, wrongdoing and harm. This is not transparent, responsible or ethical and should not be made legal. I would not want this for your daughter or mine or any woman in Nevada. Thank you for serving our State and protecting our women. I urge you to vote no on A.B. 411.

MELISSA CLEMENT (Executive Director, Nevada Right to Life):
No other pharmaceuticals would receive the protection and secrecy of these two drugs. What are these pills? They are not morning after [pills], emergency contraception or Plan B—abortion pills are a two-drug process. The first drug, mifepristone, starves a baby in utero; the second drug, misoprostol, ejects the baby from the uterus. When this drug was originally approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), three medical appointments were required to protect against ectopic pregnancy, sepsis and infection.

Sadly, over the last 25 years, all of these requirements have been lifted. Now, the abortion pill regimen often occurs at home, alone, with no medical supervision. For many wome, it's traumatic, painful and dangerous. Imagine finding your daughter, your sister or wife bleeding with a high temperature and in intense pain. She would be protected by the bare minimum—presumably a prescription bottle with a doctor's name who has presumably treated her.

Medical teams need to know who the prescribing doctor is, not just the name of the practice. No one should have to navigate through a medical practice and phone triage when every second counts. The report just referenced [in the committee meeting] is a current report and dwarfs the tiny clinical trial data. The FDA originally approved this drug based on a study of only 30,000 women and cherry-picked conditions. When A.B. 411 was proposed, the bill sponsor was unaware of the report released this past week. Given these devastating statistics, I urge you to vote no on this bill.

THERESA DEGRAFFENREID:
Assembly Bill 411 is dangerous for women because it hides the name of the prescribing doctor. This is very important information in case of a complication after taking the abortion pills. When I was in school, my best friend came to live with us after she was kicked out of her house. Her boyfriend had taken her to get an abortion without telling anyone else. When she got back to our house, she started hemorrhaging; and because nobody knew about the abortion, we just thought she was having a heavy period. She went to bed, started going in and out of consciousness and was bleeding out. She finally admitted to having an abortion, and we took her to the emergency room.

Abortions by medication involve a course of two pills. The first pill starves the fetus of the hormones it needs to survive, killing it. The second pill causes cramps, and the woman bleeds heavily to empty the uterus. If the bleeding is too heavy, like what my friend experienced, it is critical to get immediate medical attention. The prescribing doctor is the best source of information about the patient and for safety reasons, it is important information. Why is it even important for the doctor to have immunity to begin with?

Even giving testimony today, I was required to publicly say and spell my name for the record. Isn't a woman's health more important than that? It's unbelievable that we would allow providers to hide behind this law when women's health and lives are at stake. Please do not pass this dangerous bill.

SENATOR PAZINA:
We do like to get everyone's name so the committee secretary can record it for the record. If anyone would like to stay anonymous, you are welcome to do that also.

ELIZABETH MACMENAMIN (Retail Association of Nevada; Chain Drug Council):
I am here for policy reasons as I have concerns after talking to the Majority Leader on the bill language. My first concern is about changing the label. Our members are nationwide, and a smaller pharmacy may not have the same issues. But to take and change one aspect of a technically electronic prescription? We don't carry them [prescriptions] by horse to the next person anymore, so changing the name of the prescriber to the provider—we are prohibited from doing that. We interpret 21 USC section 352(f)(1) as requiring the name of the prescriber on the label to ascertain the drug is safe and to allow federal entities to track and locate the prescriber.

The Majority Leader is working with the Retail Association and our members on their concerns for a number of reasons. This bill would put the liability back on the pharmacist. Pharmacists are very concerned about their licenses and don't want to lose them by changing something on a prescription label that is required by federal law. We are still working with the Majority Leader, and I appreciate everything she has done. I know this is a passionate issue and appreciate your time this morning listening to our concerns.

DEBORAH COSTELLO (Executive Director, First Choice Pregnancy Services):
Let me share with you just a few of the heartbreaking stories we have encountered at our center from women who took the abortion pill. One mother brought her tiny baby, approximately seven weeks [gestation] to our service in a sandwich bag. She had taken an abortion pill and asked if everything had passed. She was desperately seeking answers in the midst of her heartbreak.

Another mother shared the traumatic story of her chemical abortion with our sonographer. She recalled delivering her baby on the bathroom floor at just 15 weeks. For three days afterward, she battled swelling and a high fever and ignored the symptoms until a concerned friend urged her to seek medical help. At the hospital, she learned the devastating news that she had been carrying twins, and the second baby was still inside causing a life-threatening septic infection. She then had to undergo a surgical abortion. Since then, this woman has been haunted by the nightmares every night.

Another 28-year-old young woman also shared her heartbreaking story with us. She had taken the abortion pill to end her pregnancy, unaware it would lead to a devastating complication requiring a full hysterectomy—robbing her of the ability to bear children in the future. These are not isolated incidents. These are

real women suffering real trauma, often in silence and alone. Removing the prescribing physician's name from abortion pill packaging only worsens their isolation. It also sends a chilling message—you're on your own—no provider to call, no one responsible, no face to the decision that ended a life and shattered another. For the sake of transparency, responsibility and the safety of women of Nevada, do not strip away the last thread of accountability—

CHAIR PAZINA:
Thank you so much, but you are over the two-minute limit.

ELISHEBA DELOTE:
I have been a registered surgical charge nurse for 20-plus years and oppose A.B. 411 because it poses a serious threat to women's health, medical accountability and emergency care in our State. I want to highlight how this bill is a risk to women's health by potentially reducing oversight of medical prescriptions. This could expose women to severe physical and mental health risk without proper medical supervision. Complications from medical abortions such as excessive bleeding or infection could go undetected or untreated, leading to life threatening situations. Women deserve comprehensive care, not policies that prioritize convenience over safety. This bill weakens doctor accountability and risks letting them off the hook through inadequate patient screening, insufficient follow-up care and the potential for overprescription.

When doctors aren't held to high standards, patient trust erodes, and women are left to face the consequences alone. Accountability must not take a backseat to administrative short cuts. This bill would present challenges for emergency personnel and burden emergency responders who will be without clear records or communication from prescribing doctors. Emergency personnel may lack critical information when treating complications related to prescription abortion. This delays care and places patients and responders at risk during a medical crisis. I urge the Legislature to reject A.B. 411. Any policy changes—

SENATOR PAZINA:
Thank you so much. I want to get more people in Las Vegas and more people on the phones, but I encourage everyone who has additional testimony to turn that into the committee secretary.

GRACE TRUJILLO (Nevada Right to Life):
I have been a PHN [public health nurse] for 20-plus years. I have worked with a lot of high-risk pregnancy patients in clinics and hospitals in different situations. I oppose this bill based solely on my own experience. Have you ever been in a situation where you're out in the field and talking with clients? Imagine you're a father picking up prescribed medication for his wife who is having a high-risk pregnancy, and the label reads Desert Medical Group.

They have no idea which doctor in the group made the decision [to prescribe the medication]. They later learn that the dosage was incorrect, or a mistake was made that could have been caught if the prescription could be traced back to a specific practitioner. Instead, they must navigate a maze of bureaucracy and are unsure who to trust or blame. This is not just inconvenient—dangerous mistakes do happen. Hiding the prescriber's identity makes it harder to contact them. It does not protect patients or ensure justice.

We are supposed to be an advocate for patients—not thinking about ourselves in the medical field. Current law requires the name of the prescribing practitioner to be on the prescription label for a reason. As everyone has mentioned, transparency ensures patients know who is responsible for their care, fosters direct communication and upholds accountability. Replacing that with a generic healthcare practice strips away our ability to connect with the human being behind the prescription and the doctor who knows their history.

Our needs are fierce. This bill depersonalizes medicine at a time when we need better connection more than ever. Proponents might argue this change protects practitioners' privacy or shields them from harassment. While I understand those concerns, blurring accountability on the prescription label isn't the answer. It sacrifices the patient's safety for the sake of the patient, and that is the tradeoff we cannot afford. Knowing the doctor's name for every prescription gives patients confidence to ask questions and seek clarification—

SENATOR PAZINA:
It's been two minutes, so we will go to the next testifier. Thank you so much, and you can provide your comments to the committee secretary or submit them online.

MS. DOUGLASS:
I rise in strong opposition to A.B. 411. This bill seeks to remove the name of the prescribing doctor from the abortion pill prescription. This move would raise serious concerns about transparency, accountability and patient safety in every other area of medicine. The prescribing physician should be clearly identified. Why should abortion be treated differently? Removing the doctor's name severs the vital connection between patient and provider if a woman experiences complications [from a medicine abortion]—we know that that can happen—from hemorrhaging, infection and incomplete abortion; how would her family know who to follow up with? This bill doesn't empower women—it abandons them.

It also opens the door to potential abuse. Without the prescribing doctor's information, how do we ensure that the prescription was issued legally? How do we hold bad actors accountable, especially in cases where pills were being distributed illegally or without proper screening? Nevadans deserve a healthcare system rooted in transparency and responsibility. Shielding providers from accountability is not health care. It's a political cover at the expense of women's safety. I urge you to reject A.B. 411. Let's not carve out special protections to compromise medical standards and public trust.

MR. HOJJATY:
I oppose A.B. 411.

KATRIN IVANOFF:
I am surprised that while your constituents want more transparency, you guys are trying to pass a bill that's the total opposite of that. For the sake of time, I will ditto everything in opposition. Please vote no on A.B. 411.

MS. FERGUS:
I strongly oppose A.B. 411. This bill sets a dangerous precedent by allowing prescribers of specific drugs, mifepristone and misoprostol, to remove their names from the prescription labels and substitute the name of the medical practice. This is not about privacy. It's about withholding transparency. In a profession that demands the highest ethical standards, medical providers take an oath to serve patients with honesty, integrity and accountability. If a practitioner is not comfortable placing their name on a prescription, they should not be prescribing it. This isn't about beliefs—it's about responsibility. We do not allow anonymous medical care in other areas of practice, and we should not begin here.

This bill is the tipping point toward a system where medical providers and institutions will hide behind labels instead of standing by their decisions. It opens the door to obscuring information from patients and undermines trust in the entire healthcare system. Regardless of one's stance on abortion, this bill is a clear deviation from transparency and moves us further from what the public expects and voted for. I urge you to reject the veiled attempt to normalize secrecy in medical care. Please vote no on A.B. 411.

JIM DEGRAFFENREID (National Committeeman, Nevada Republican Party):
I am here to oppose A.B. 411. On behalf of the Nevada Republican Party, we echo the comments made earlier by others. We find it somewhat ironic that a bill designed to hide information is numbered 411. It was clear from the bill presentation that this legislation seeks to make the State complicit in interfering with other state laws—concealing the name of providers who prescribe medications in states where it is illegal for those providers to do so.

Decades ago, the people of Nevada chose to enshrine some of the most liberal abortion laws in America into statute. We believe that all states should have the ability to enact their own laws on abortion without our State interfering; we would not want other states to interfere with our laws. We believe it's important for women's safety to include the name of the prescribing physician on prescriptions, despite the typical desire of the abortion industry to work under the cover of darkness. Please prioritize women's health over corporate wealth and oppose A.B. 411.

CARL MAALOUF:
There should be great fear and apprehension about prescribing a drug that kills a human being. The fear of a physician putting their name on a label seems a little a little off. If they want to participate in the practice of medicine, they need to put their name on the label of any medication they are prescribing—take full responsibility for it. An acquaintance of mine works at the sewer district here in Las Vegas. It seems like he's fishing out human beings [remains] every day and giving them a proper burial—this is all from the abortion bill. It's really happening, and we should do something about it, not hide behind it. We should do something—it's really bad and needs to stop.

DEVIN LIVZIEY (Vice Chairman, Clark County Republican Party):
This bill was intended to protect the physician from having his name out there on these medications. But instead of putting the physician at risk, supposedly, it

puts the entire clinic at risk. It seems like you're just shifting the threat of whatever happens from the physician to the entire clinic where that physician works. This is just the first step, and "if you give an inch, they'll take a mile." What other prescriptions will be included in the future? Will physicians not want their name to be on highly addicting drugs that killed Michael Jackson or Prince—drugs like that. I think that physicians need to stand up and take responsibility for their actions on prescriptions whether it be negative or positive. They should do their job to the best of their ability.

JANINE HANSEN (Nevada Families for Freedom):
Please put it on the record that we're in opposition to A.B. 411. I know time is limited.

SENATOR PAZINA:
We have your name as being in opposition. If you have more comments, we invite you to share them with our committee secretary to get them on the record, or you can send them by email.

KARL REINARZ:
I oppose A.B. 411.

ERICA NEALY:
I oppose A.B. 411. Veterinarians in Nevada have to write their names on prescriptions for animals. Why shouldn't a woman get the same consideration?

MICHELLE BARNES:
I oppose A.B. 411.

MS. JOHNSTON-LINSDAY:
I oppose this bill.

CHAIR PAZINA:
Thank you all so much. If you had other comments, we ask that you share those with our committee secretary because we would love to get them on the record to share with the entire committee. There is no testimony in neutral; it's not surprising, but you never know. Jeff Koelemay, our committee counsel, would like to provide some information on the federal guidelines.

MR. KOELEMAY:
I will provide some information that may be helpful to the committee. I will first mention the scope of the bill the way I read it. There's a difference between a prescription that is written by a prescribing practitioner and when a prescription is ultimately dispensed to a customer. There's a label that goes on the container itself—the pill bottle. The label on the actual pill bottle is different than the actual original prescription.

That is an important distinction about the scope of the bill to the extent that the question came up about federal laws. There are extensive federal laws and regulations about labeling. As you can imagine, the FDA has implemented extensive labeling requirements for certain controlled substances. But federal labeling requirements for human prescriptions, drugs and biological products that are not controlled substances are regulated by the FDA and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

My understanding is that these substances [mifepristone and misoprostol] are not controlled substances. The relevant federal regulations section and code is 21 CFR 201.56. I'm not aware of any requirement that the name of the prescribing petitioner must be included on the label affixed to the pill bottle itself. This [bill] appears to be completely consistent with the federal law and regulations about the way the drug stuff works.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI:
Pharmacists and doctors are being targeted and being subjected to real harassment for doing their jobs. The hostile environment is prompting many providers to withdraw from serving these patients, jeopardizing their fundamental right to reproductive health care. We wouldn't need this bill if there weren't threats. Louisiana has issued a national arrest warrant for a New York doctor for prescribing these drugs because her name was on a pill bottle. Louisiana's criminal penalties include 15 years in prison, up to a $200,000 fine and loss of license. Reproductive health care is health care, and we need to protect physicians and pharmacists who are simply trying to do their job.

SENATOR PAZINA:
The committee also received seven letters in opposition (Exhibit F) to A.B. 411 and a commentary news article from Janine Hansen (Exhibit G contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request from the Research Library.) relating to A.B. 411. I will close the bill hearing on A.B. 411. I want to

thank all members of the public who came out to testify in support or in opposition. Our last bill presentation will be A.B. 196.

ASSEMBLY BILL 196: Revises provisions governing psychology. (BDR 54-164)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER SHEA M. BACKUS (Assembly District No. 37):
I am joined here today by my intern Megan Cavallero, a junior at the University of Nevada, Reno, who is pursuing a double major in psychology and philosophy. Laura Arnold will also be joining us through Zoom. She is the executive director of the Nevada State Board of Psychological Examiners. We appreciate the opportunity to present A.B. 196 which proposes revisions to the regulation of psychology in Nevada, a vital part of modern healthcare education and policy.

The request for the Board of Psychological Examiners to modify NRS 641 was made by former lobbyist Neena Laxalt to myself. Although she passed away in January 2025, I'm fortunate to have an intern who's pursuing studies in psychology. As Ms. Cavallero has done much of the work on this bill, she will do most of the presentation today. Ms. Arnold and I are also available to answer any questions the committee may have.

MEGAN CAVALLARO (Legislative Intern to Assemblymember Shea M. Backus):
The demand for psychological services has never been higher. More effort has been put into protecting and regulating mental health services than ever before. An area of psychology that has had a profound impact on the field is psychological testing from which assessment and diagnosis take place. Licensing, oversight and ethical standards are essential to psychological testing to ensure that practitioners are qualified, competent and held accountable.

There are currently laws in place governing who can perform these tests. Unlicensed individuals may perform certain psychological testing under the direct supervision and periodic observation of a licensed psychologist. These individuals are typically students at the professional level who are training to obtain their license. Assembly Bill 196 proposes to allow these unlicensed administrators to use the title of psychometrist—currently prohibited under NAC 641.168—and expand the terminology of those who already administer the psychological tests to include psychometrist.

As proposed, A.B. 196 would better align with how the term "psychometrist" is used nationwide, and address issues created by Nevada's narrow definition of

the designation. In Nevada, the definition of psychometrist is "a medical professional who is trained in administering and scoring psychological tests." A psychometrist can administer and interpret certain tests, and interpret and refer the test results to a supervisor who will then make a diagnosis and recommend a requisite treatment plan or referral.

To be clear, this bill does not require anyone to use the term psychometrist—it simply allows qualified individuals to use the designation, aligning Nevada with how the term is applied nationwide and giving trained and educated individuals a measure of formal authority. This bill allows the Board of Psychological Examiners to create regulations governing the requirements of who can be called a psychometrist. This will prevent unqualified individuals from using the term and limit the spread of misinformation.

Another aspect of this bill is to ensure a limitation period for when a complaint can be filed with the Board against a psychologist. Currently, there is no limitation period for the filing of complaints after the event giving rise to the complaint. Introducing social limitation will align Nevada with other jurisdictions and ensure all cases can be evaluated promptly, fairly and allow for the introduction of current evidence.

Lastly, this bill repeals NRS 641.2265 to maintain efficiency and clear up confusion. The Board has chosen not to register business entities, corporations or partnerships. This decision is due to other state agencies that already register these business entities, making the task redundant and unnecessary for the Board to perform.

I will now walk you through the sections of the bill. Section 1, subsection 1 allows the Board to adopt regulations authorizing licensed psychologists to allow an unlicensed person to perform certain psychological tests under direct supervision. Section 1, subsection 2 exempts the term "psychometrist" from the prohibitions in NRS 641 and allows those who score psychology tests as described in subsection 1 to use the term psychometrist in connection with the administration of those tests. Section 2, subsection 1 addresses conforming changes. Section 2, subsection 2 establishes a three-year limitation period in which a complaint can be filed against a psychologist from when the event giving rise to the complaint occurred.

Lastly, NRS 641.2265 which requires certain businesses to register with the Board will be repealed. I ask you to support A.B. 196.

LAURA ARNOLD (Executive Director, Board of Psychological Examiners):
I don't have anything to add to the wonderful bill presentation but am happy to answer any questions you have.

SENATOR DALY:
I just looked at the authority of the Board to adopt regulations. Is this a new area or a new term that you felt you did not have authority to regulate before? Are you planning on adopting regulations to do this? I hope the answer is yes; otherwise, it's a futile exercise.

MS. ARNOLD:
Yes, to both questions. This issue was brought to us by a licensee who does psychological testing and was echoed by others. The problem is that NRS 641.440, subsection 4 limits the use of the term "psychometrist" to psychologists only. Nationwide, however, those identified in the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) 641.168, subsection 1, paragraph (c) perform psychological testing with psychometric training. Nationwide, they are referred to as psychometrists. Nevada is the only state that restricts them from using that term. This bill is intended to provide a narrow exception to the definition that exists for a psychometrist and to extend the definition to those identified in NAC 641.168, subsection 1, paragraph (c) in addition to psychologists.

SENATOR DALY:
I was looking at the authority you now have to adopt regulations, and it says you can adopt any other regulations. It's not inconsistent with existing law. If you already have a narrow definition, this is the only time you can change the term; otherwise, it would be a violation. This bill is necessary.

MS. ARNOLD:
The intent is to allow those who are identified in NAC 168, subsection 1, paragraph (c) to use the term psychometrist if they want to—like other people do across the country. They're not required to use the term if they don’t want to.

SPENCER FLANDERS (Nevada Psychological Association):
We support A.B. 196. We are facing a mental healthcare crisis in Nevada, and it's more important than ever for us to provide timely and effective care.

Assembly Bill 196 allows licensed psychologists to delegate specific tasks to trained assistants—psychometrists, under supervision. This makes it possible for patients to be seen without sacrificing the quality of care. This bill ensures that testing remains accurate, reliable and gives patients quicker access to necessary services. Allowing assistants to use the psychometrist title provides clarity to the rule and provides transparency and trust. This bill also sets a reasonable timeline for filing complaints, protecting both patients and providers. Assembly Bill 196 increases access to care with high professional standards. We urge the committee's support.

MS. FERGUS:
I oppose A.B. 196. This bill is a reckless shift in mental health oversight, authorizing unlicensed individuals to perform psychological testing under the vague title of psychometrist. We are opening the floodgates to unqualified people who influence the most critical decisions in mental health, including diagnoses tied to gender reassignment, legal competency or medication. Unlicensed equals unaccountable.

There is no licensing board to discipline so-called psychometrists who make a mistake and if harm is done. Victims have no direct recourse, no license to suspend and no standards to enforce. A three-year complaint limit equals institutional cover-up. This bill bars complaints after three years, even if the misconduct was hidden or the harm wasn't discovered until later. This is not oversight—it's a free pass to negligence. Psychology is not a training ground, and we don't need shortcuts or cost-cutting in mental health.

Society's obsession with inclusion and opinion-based identity is already destabilizing medical ethics, and now you want to introduce unlicensed voices in the mental health system? This is how standards collapse. Do not let Nevada become the next testing ground for politicized psychology and unqualified mental health work. Please vote no on A.B. 196.

MR. HOJJATY:
I ditto the previous commentator.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BACKUS:
I heard some comments—whenever anything is represented that I don't think is accurate, I want to make sure the committee is comfortable with the representations made. Obviously, if a psychometrist is working under a licensed psychologist, the psychologist would be subject to disciplinary measures by the Board. If there was any civil liability exposed for any malpractice committed, an action could be brought against the psychologist. I wanted to put that out there. I haven't had the opportunity to talk to Ms. Fergus about this bill, but we didn't have this kind of opposition in the Assembly. I wanted to make the record clear and accurate with respect to liability. Moreover, psychometrists are already approved in other states, so this is not something new we are doing in Nevada.

SENATOR PAZINA:
We will close the bill hearing on A.B. 196 and move to our last order of business today which is public comment. Please keep your comment to two minutes.

MR. HOJJATY:
I really enjoyed this meeting. I went to two meetings back-to-back and appreciate your efforts. As this is the Committee on Commerce and Labor, I want to talk about the minimum wage issue. The last time it was addressed was in the 2019 Legislative Session. I understand that raising the minimum wage has its issues. It increases costs and does not fully address our problems—the cost of living and income inequality. There are many benefits to raising the minimum wage.

One of the obvious benefits is it allows extra dollars to be put in the pockets of Nevadans, especially the working class. Nevada's minimum wage is $11.50 per hour with insurance [provided] and $12.50 without insurance. Depending on how you look at it, this number is too low. I was looking for a job at a rental car business that cleans vehicles, and they only paid minimum wage. It is pathetically low—they make so much money and should pay their employees better. The current policy is flat and stagnant—who knows when there's going to be another bill addressing this issue.

I do have an idea in mind. The states of Washington and Oregon have pegged their minimum wage to the consumer price index (CPI), and it adjusts every single year. Let's say that in 2026 we adjust for CPI for the rate of inflation. It would increase to $13.20 per hour and adjust year after year. Make no

mistake—the minimum wage should be flexible—not just with insurance but with large employers also. We have a lot of tipped employees, including myself. Then, the minimum wage should be lower, like $13 something per hour. But if you are a large employer, like Walmart where many of their employees have to depend on benefits to survive, it's so pathetic. Their minimum wage should be $3 higher than businesses with fewer than 25 employees and—

SENATOR PAZINA:
You are over two minutes, so please wrap up your comments.

MR. HOJJATY:
I'm asking you to introduce a bill in the 2027 Legislative Session. We would really appreciate it as it would affect all workers from all over who make up to $25 per hour. It's a great pleasure.

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

CHAIR PAZINA:
As there is no other business, I will adjourn the meeting at 10:20 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Cherie Dittler
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Julie Pazina, Chair

DATE:

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	**Exhibit Letter**	**Introduced on Minute Report Page No.**	**Witness / Entity**	**Description**
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
A.B. 241	C	11	Ron M. Aryel	Opposition Letter
A.B. 241	D	12	Washoe County, Douglas County	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 241	E	12	Clark County	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 411	F	39	Senator Julie Pazina	7 Opposition Letters
A.B. 411	G	39	Janine Hansen	Commentary from news article [contains copyrighted material].