MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Eighty-third Session
May 23, 2025

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Marilyn Dondero Loop at 3:28 p.m. on Friday, May 23, 2025, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 6 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. Link to Executive Budget. Link to Budget Amendments.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair
Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen, Vice Chair
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro
Senator Dina Neal
Senator Angela D. Taylor
Senator Carrie Ann Buck
Senator Robin L. Titus
Senator Jeff Stone

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Senatorial District No. 9

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Wayne Thorley, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Cathy Crocket, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Marie Bell, Committee Assistant
Virginia Weitzel, Committee Secretary
Jacob Anderson, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Gabriel Di Chiara, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State
Erin M. Houston, Securities Administrator, Office of the Secretary of State

Jessica L. Hoban, Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Attorney General
Kacey KC, State Forester Firewarden, Division of Forestry, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Anil Manocha, Administrative Services Officer, Aging and Disability Services Division, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services
Jessica Adams, Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services
Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of Providers

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will now hear Senate Bill (S.B.) 76.

SENATE BILL 76 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to securities. (BDR 7-486)

GABRIEL DI CHIARA (Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State):
Senate Bill 76 creates the Victims of Securities Fraud Restitution Fund, a fund that would allow the Office of the Secretary of State to provide victims with some sort of compensation after a judgement has been issued confirming that they should receive that compensation but prior to them being compensated by the perpetrator of the crime or civil violation.

We had previously discussed funding the bill by diverting funds. Currently, civil penalties issued by the Securities Division of the Secretary of State's office go directly to the General Fund. In S.B. 76, we proposed creating the fund and then diverting a portion of the civil penalties issued by the Office of the Secretary of State to that fund capped at $500,000. Those civil penalties are very irregular. It is hard to say how much money will be generated in any given fiscal year, which is what makes doing some of that estimation very difficult.

Understanding the fiscal situation that the State is in, we sent a conceptual amendment (Exhibit C) a couple of days ago moving the effective date for the funding section to July 1, 2027. That would push that out into fiscal year (FY) 2027-2028 but would create the fund now so it can accept gifts and grants. We may be able to secure funding to pay out compensation to victims even before the state funding mechanism kicks in.

SENATOR TITUS:
Do we keep a running total of all these bills that we do not start initiating the fiscal impact until the 2027-2029 biennium?

WAYNE THORLEY (Senate Fiscal Analyst):
I do not have one, but we can do it.

SENATOR TITUS:
I think that would be a wise thing. We have been doing that more than I am familiar with in the past six sessions. I want to know what we are obligating the State to do in the future biennium.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
I think the question asked by Senator Titus is an interesting one. I would be curious to see … Sometimes that may make sense if there is some sort of process in place that is going to change things or if that would allow for additional time on some of those bills to do a waiver or to develop the program, and it would kick in beginning in the next biennium.

Can you confirm that the adjustment to change the effective date on section 10 then removes the fiscal notes? Would this program not even take place until the next biennium?

MR. DI CHIARA:
The rest of the bill establishing the Victims of Securities Fraud Restitution Fund would allow us to begin the program and potentially solicit for gifts and grants. Deputy Erin Houston may have examples of the kinds of companies that give out monies to funds like this. If possible, we would love to create the fund so we can potentially have something to give out over the course of this biennium.

ERIN M. HOUSTON (Securities Administrator, Office of the Secretary of State):
I do have a couple of examples. We have received grants in the past from the Investor Protection Trust for various types of outreach and investor recompense if necessary. We do not currently have a funding mechanism to accept those grants and then distribute those funds in the State. Oftentimes, we could receive donations from some of the larger broker-dealer firms that we regulate, not as part of their regulation. They donate to larger trusts and grants that exist on the national level that then get distributed to the State as part of an outreach from different companies.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
So if we came back next biennium and did not have funds to put into this … I am assuming that is the reason to try to reduce the fiscal note. We do not have a lot of extra revenue for many things this session. If we came back next session and there, likewise, was not this money, would you be bringing a bill to say, "We do not want this $500,000 to come in"? Why not just take it out of the bill entirely?

MR. DI CHIARA:
I believe it would be good to see how much money would be coming in. This would be funded solely by civil penalties, which are relatively irregular. We built the fiscal note around an average of those civil penalties over each fiscal year. There are some years where far more than that average comes in and some years where it is far less.

We would like to create the funding mechanism and hold off on implementing, if only so that if the State should be in a better fiscal place next legislative session. Then that money could start to be diverted in that way with that $500,000 cap. That would not be a $500,000 cap per penalty or per fiscal year. The fund could be no more than $500,000.

We would hope to come to the Legislature and confirm that diversion would work. If it does not work for the State, or if the State feels that funding mechanism is not helpful, then we could look at removing it or finding a different, more regular source of funding.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
Why would we not just remove the appropriation and have you come back next session to ask for the money?

MR. DI CHIARA:
It is not always easy to ask the Legislature for money, but if that is what you need, then that is what we can do. Our estimations for this revenue are roughly $190,000 to $200,000 per fiscal year. We may see that, we may not. We look at some funding mechanism as better than nothing. If you would prefer to have the funding mechanism out, if that would make you more comfortable, then we would be open to an amendment.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
I know you are trying to figure our interesting ways we can fund things and figuring out if we can do policy pieces with the good folks we have working in state government. You are certainly one of them. I really do appreciate your time. I am just trying to make sure, when we are looking at some of these appropriations, that we are doing that in a smart way, whether it is changing the effective date of one section or if it is removing it and hoping to come back next session to ask for some money to help fund this fund.

MR. DI CHIARA:
I understand the difficult position the Legislature is in. I am more than happy to work with anyone. We just want to make sure that victims of this specific type of fraud have an avenue to receive some recompense.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will now hear S.B. 407.

SENATE BILL 407: Revises provisions relating to legal representation for indigent persons. (BDR 14-492)

SENATOR MELANIE SCHEIBLE (Senatorial District No. 9):
You should have in front of you a copy of a conceptual amendment (Exhibit D) which completely guts and replaces S.B. 407. The original purpose of S.B. 407 was to improve indigent defense services in the State of Nevada. That is what the amendment also does, but in a very different and much less costly way.

Instead of adding a new office to the Nevada Department of Indigent Defense Services (DIDS) for an alternate public defender, S.B. 407, as amended, would address a different issue that we have been working through with stakeholders, including the Governor's Office, the American Civil Liberties Union and public defenders, throughout the State to address how the State Public Defender is appointed and the executive director of DIDS.

Senate Bill 407 sets forward a process through which the Governor would appoint the executive director of DIDS and then that executive director would be responsible for hiring the State Public Defender. Then, the rest of the DIDS programming, the rest of the staff, the deputy public defenders and contract attorneys would continue to be hired in the same way they are hired now.

Senate Bill 407 would, very importantly, ensure there is independence between the Executive Branch and the Office of Indigent Defense, which provides that crucial and constitutionally-required service of free representation to individuals accused of crimes here in the State of Nevada.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Would you reiterate what you said about the appointment or the hiring part?

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:
The Governor would appoint the executive director of DIDS. The Department of Indigent Defense Services, which is responsible for hiring contract counsel—attorneys who work in private practice but are appointed, one case at a time, when there is a conflict—would be overseen by the executive director. The executive director would also be responsible for hiring the State Public Defender who is automatically assigned to cases and who serves like we normally think of a public defender. That is their single job practicing law, serving indigent clients.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
Is the executive director a new position, or do we already have an executive director?

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:
We already have an executive director, so that is a remaining position.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
So this bill would not create a new office; it would just create the reporting line?

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:
It actually just changes how they are hired. It used to be that the Governor appointed the executive director and the State Public Defender without the board's involvement. This would have the Governor still appointing the executive director from a list of three candidates that the Board on Indigent Defense Services puts forward.

The statute is worded such that the executive director will hire the State Public Defender. The purpose of that is to say that DIDS will go through a normal hiring process for the State Public Defender as opposed to having that person hand selected and appointed by the Governor.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will now hear Assembly Bill (A.B.) 559.

ASSEMBLY BILL 559 (1st Reprint): Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Office of the Extradition Coordinator within the Office of the Attorney General for an unanticipated shortfall related to extradition costs. (BDR S-1172)

JESSICA L. HOBAN (Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Attorney General):
Assembly Bill 559 passed the Assembly with the amended version. The amendment has our final dollar amount of $1,518,208. The estimated amount, around $1.5 million, was presented by the Legislative Counsel Bureau during our budget closings on April 21, 2025. Although this amount has changed, it is a lesser amount than what the agency initially requested and what was presented previously under the Governor's recommended budget.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Is $1,250,690 the amount?

MS. HOBAN:
No. That is the original amount in the bill. The amended amount is $1,518,208.

SENATOR TITUS:
Regarding the $1 million extra in extradition costs, the costs are from transporting criminals. Is that not correct?

MS. HOBAN:
That is correct. The Extraditions Program is based on felony charges and interstate transports. If someone happens to be held in custody in another state but they still have a charge in the State of Nevada, we have agreements where we can transport them to come to Nevada and stand trial for the warrants against them here. We reimburse for costs for all of the counties. This is a statewide extradition program.

SENATOR TITUS:
It seemed high, but if a county has someone who has been arrested in another state, you cover the cost to move those folks too. Is that correct?

MS. HOBAN:
That is correct.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will now hear A.B. 561.

ASSEMBLY BILL 561 (1st Reprint): Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Division of Forestry of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for an unanticipated shortfall related to firefighting costs. (BDR S-1176)

KACEY KC (State Forester Firewarden, Division of Forestry, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):
Assembly Bill 561 is for a supplemental appropriation for the Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF) for the cost of wildland fire suppression in the amount of $20,733,824. Of that, roughly $18.6 [million] pays back the General Fund advance to the division to pay bills and approximately $2.14 [million] is for additional bills that are still outstanding to be paid.

Since October 2024, we have invoiced $37.9 million in reimbursements, of which, we have received $23.1 million in reimbursement revenue back. We still have about $16.1 million to invoice, but these numbers change every single day as we pay bills and we have to put them back on the invoice. We have about $19.3 million left to be paid by NDF.

Earlier this week, the Interim Finance Committee approved our work program to utilize the funds that had been brought in to pay bills. I am happy to report that since that happened yesterday and today, we have paid just over $7.2 million in bills processed. They are working feverishly over there to continue those payments. That will change your invoiced amount on the other side as they start to move them over.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
I know the request is for about $18 million. Part of what you are going to do with that money is pay the General Fund back. It sounds like you want money from the General Fund to pay the General Fund back. Did I get that right?

MS. KC:
Yes, that is correct. The General Fund advance was first given to us this year. It is required to be paid back. It was intended, if we were to bring the money in, and we have brought in some money, you would either give that to pay back bills now, or we had to bring in the General Fund to pay back the General Fund, or however it works on the other side of the money. We are required to pay back the General Fund advances.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
Okay, that just seems like, "Thanks for loaning me a hundred dollars. Can you loan me a hundred dollars so I can pay your hundred dollars back?"

SENATOR STONE:
Could you elaborate on the $16 million still left to be billed? When is that billed? When are we going to receive that? Is that something that is going to be going back to the General Fund?

MS. KC:
Yes, $16.1 million is ready to be invoiced for either out-of-state fires or in-state cost share reimbursements. We are working on it every day, and these numbers change every single day. This was the last time I pulled them. They are moving as quickly as they can. We are finally fully staffed. As of the earlier part of this week, we got our sixth person in place, and we have a contractor working day and night on this. They have been moving and those reimbursements have been coming in fairly quickly.

We were between 220 days and 14 days on payments. They are moving through as quickly as we have seen them move through. Yes, it will come back in and then it will get replaced [by] the $7.2 million we just paid out in bills, though some of those will then move into reimbursements. These numbers are in a constant state of shuffle. It is as good as the data that I had at the time I pulled it to talk to you guys.

SENATOR STONE:
Is any part of that roughly $16 million coming back to the General Fund, or is that just used to pay outstanding debts that you have?

MS. KC:
It will come back into the Forestry Fire Suppression budget account (B/A) 101-4196. Depending on when it comes back in, it can be utilized to pay back bills, or it may go back to the General Fund. If it comes in close to the end of the fiscal year, it gets swept back into the General Fund. If it comes in and we have time to ask to utilize it and if the authority is available to pay bills, we will do that.

INFRASTRUCTURE

CONSERVATION & NATURAL RESOURCES

DCNR - Forestry - Fire Suppression — Budget Page DCNR-109 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4196

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Do you have an estimate of time that you think you might be done with this initial billing piece that needed to be done?

MS. KC:
We are fairly close to being done with those bills. The last I checked—it has been about a month—we were just over $20 million of the approximately $32 million. The numbers do not match exactly correctly because there were things that were not included in the audit that we have found since or just different numbers. We are very close to getting those done.

The hardest ones are the oldest ones from that 2021 year, when we were not inside of the new billing system. It is harder to pull that data. That is what the contractor is working on. We are fairly certain we are going to be done with all of those. In the meantime, others keep coming in.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
When we have fires that are just across the line, like the one happening right now in Mono County—the Inn Fire, I think it is being called—are we immediately called in, or do the California entities handle that and only call us if there is a bigger spread?

MS. KC:
It depends. There are parts of California that are immediately within our dispatch footprint, right across the border into Mono County. That is part of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest. We are on the run card for immediate response into those areas. For most fires—like Tamarack or Caldor; any of those fires—CAL FIRE or the Forest Service go in. They will utilize all of their available resources.

It is just like we do. It starts at a local dispatch center. We are using the closest available resources: state, local, contract and federal. Once we get beyond what we have available in our local dispatch center, we go to the regional dispatch center. Once that is tapped out, we go to the national center. We are not an immediate [resource] on those calls, but there are times when CAL FIRE will call us directly if they are short.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I know the Mono Fire is just outside of Hawthorne. We were all watching that, so I was just curious.

We will now hear A.B. 586.

ASSEMBLY BILL 586: Makes supplemental appropriations to the Aging and Disability Services Division of the Department of Health and Human Services for an unanticipated shortfall related to costs associated with certain provider payments. (BDR S-1173)

ANIL MANOCHA (Administrative Services Officer, Aging and Disability Services Division, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services):
Assembly Bill 586 provides a supplemental appropriation due to a shortfall in funding for provider payments for services provided to older persons, individuals with physical disabilities and individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities. The amount allocated in the bill aligns with what was discussed during our budget closing. There are no changes in the numbers.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Is the total for the four budgets $16.2 million?

MR. MANOCHA:
[The total is] $16.19 million, close to $16.2 million.

SENATOR TITUS:
[The request is for approximately] $16 million over four categories of providers. Is that what you are saying?

MR. MANOCHA:
This is for the four budget accounts [B/A 101-3167, B/A 101-3266, B/A 101-3279 and B/A 101-3280].

HUMAN SERVICES

AGING AND DISABILITY SERVICES

DHS-ADSD - Rural Regional Center — Budget Page DHS-ADSD-31 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3167

DHS-ADSD - Home and Community-Based Services — Budget Page DHS-ADSD-75 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3266

DHS-ADSD - Desert Regional Center — Budget Page DHS-ADSD-102 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3279

DHS-ADSD - Sierra Regional Center — Budget Page DHS-ADSD-115 (Volume II)
Budget Account 101-3280

SENATOR TITUS:
In the four budget accounts, how many providers are we paying with the $16 million? How many patients do they have?

JESSICA ADAMS (Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services):
We would have to get you exact numbers. I am not entirely sure. For the three budget accounts related to developmental services, across the State we have probably over 200 providers. There are over 4,500 people receiving services through those providers.

Through the Office of Community Living for our Community Options Program for the Elderly and the Personal Assistance Services Program, I am not sure how

many providers there are or how many people are receiving services at this time.

SENATOR TITUS:
I would understand that, as an agency, you have a budget based on how many clients you have with their anticipated medical needs and how often they would be seeing a provider. Then, we budget in advance on caseloads.

Now, we are looking at a shortfall of $16 million. How did that happen? Was there a dramatic increase in what we paid the providers? Was it on our end in what we authorized? This is part of the issue; we authorized increased Medicaid reimbursement rates, and we offered increasing provider rates. That usually comes with a fiscal note, or we anticipate what that will cost us when we increase these provider rates. How did we get caught in this? Was it on our end that we authorized provider increases that you did not anticipate? Was there a sudden influx of patients you did not anticipate? How did we get here?

MS. ADAMS:
For the smaller amount for the Office of Community Living, that was a rate increase that was authorized in the last session. That increase came along with a higher utilization. We were serving the same number of people, but there were more services utilized.

SENATOR TITUS:
Did more providers sign up?

MS. ADAMS:
Yes, more people wanted to be able to give services. On the developmental services side, which is the largest part of this, there also was a provider rate increase that was authorized last session—it was just authorized a little bit low for what was actually needed. Throughout this whole fiscal year, we have been holding new services to make sure as much as we could that we were not overspending, and we were adding people onto our Medicaid waiver so we would be able to maximize federal dollars. It was a mismatch in how the fiscal note was calculated for last session.

SENATOR TITUS:
That leads into where I was going with all of this. When we propose a potential bill and it goes through with a fiscal note that cannot be determined at that time

because you do not know if you are going to get more providers and more access … I am supportive of this [bill] because this is what happened based on what we did over here and then you did your jobs. It is a classic example of how we cannot always know what the fiscal note is going to be on these major policy changes that we do on this end. We have to hold ourselves accountable for it.

MARY PIERCZYNSKI (Nevada Association of Providers):
Our group takes care of intellectually disabled [people] in living arrangements and also Jobs and Day Training. We appreciate your consideration of these additional funds.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will begin a work session. I will start with S.B. 76 and ask Mr. Thorley to take over.

MR. THORLEY:
Senate Bill 76 revises provisions relating to securities. It was just presented by the Secretary of State's office. There was a conceptual amendment Exhibit C presented to move the effective date of the funding mechanism in the bill to FY 2027-2028, so not the upcoming biennium but the biennium after that.

There was discussion about possibly removing the funding mechanism from the bill altogether, leaving the bill to create the account that could accept gifts, grants and donations. The funding for the account could then be addressed either through a General Fund appropriation or another mechanism in the 2027 Legislative Session.

If the committee wishes to go that route, the motion would be to amend and do pass as amended with the amendment to remove the funding mechanism altogether, leaving in the language about the account creation and the accepting of gifts, grants and donations.

> SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND TO REMOVE THE FUNDING AMOUNT BUT STILL KEEPING THAT AUTHORIZING LANGUAGE AS CONTAINED IN THE BILL AND DO PASS S.B. 76 AS AMENDED.
>
> SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
During the discussion in the hearing, there are some bills that we are seeing where they have asked for an extended date for implementation and effective dates. What makes me more comfortable with that mechanism to remove a fiscal note is the idea that there is something else that has to take place before that funding kicks in. This feels like a funding mechanism that would just come online next session but not because there is some sort of waiver. There are bills where we have had that discussion.

I think it would be totally appropriate for the Secretary of State's Office to see how they do in getting the grants and the monies that may come into that account, being able to administer them and to report back to us. Hopefully, they have been able to give money to some of these victims of crime and then be able to ask for what would be the right and appropriate amount, whether that is the $500,000 appropriation that was in this bill or an additional amount, whatever would best serve the functions for this account. Based on their testimony, I think they would be able to administer something in the interim with those gift and grant monies. To me, this makes a little more sense from a fiscal policy standpoint.

SENATOR TITUS:
I am going to be a nay on this. I look forward to seeing an amendment. I may switch to a yes on the floor. I am going to be a no at this time the way the bill stands.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS BUCK, STONE AND TITUS VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go to Senate Bill 407.

CATHY CROCKET (Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst):
Senate Bill 407 was heard today in committee. The bill was presented by Senator Scheible who presented an amendment to replace the existing provisions of the bill with an amendment making various changes to the State Public Defender's Office.

The bill has no fiscal impact. There were no comments in support, opposition or neutral. If the committee wished to adopt the amendment presented, the appropriate motion would be to amend and do pass as amended.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 407.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS BUCK, STONE AND TITUS VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go to Assembly Bill 559.

MR. THORLEY:
Assembly Bill 559 makes a supplemental appropriation to the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) for the extradition coordinator. The bill was presented by the OAG.

The amount was amended in the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. The current amount in the bill is $1.5 million for the supplemental appropriation.

There were no amendments presented. If the committee wishes to move this bill, the appropriate action would be do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 559.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go on to Assembly Bill 561.

MS. CROCKET:
Assembly Bill 561 was heard in committee today. It makes a supplemental appropriation of $20.7 million to the NDF to repay General Fund advances and to fund incident response costs. No amendments were presented. There were no comments in support, opposition or neutral. If the committee wishes to move the bill, the motion would be to do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED DO PASS A.B. 561.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will move to Assembly Bill 586.

MR. THORLEY:
Assembly Bill 586 makes an appropriation to the Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD) for an unanticipated shortfall related to costs associated with certain provider payments. The bill was presented by ADSD. Testimony in support came from the Nevada Association of Providers. There was no testimony in opposition or neutral. There were no amendments. The total amount of the bill is approximately $16.2 million, and that is included in the Governor's recommended budget. If the committee wishes to move this bill, the appropriate action would be do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED DO PASS A.B. 586.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will move on to Senate Bill 54.

MR. THORLEY:
Senate Bill 54 was heard on May 21, 2025, in this committee. It requires Medicaid to provide coverage of certain services for persons experiencing homelessness. The bill was presented by the City of Las Vegas. There was testimony in support from the Nevada Primary Care Association, opposition from the Nevada Republican Party and no neutral testimony.

SENATE BILL 54 (1st Reprint): Requires Medicaid to provide coverage of certain services for persons experiencing homelessness. (BDR 38-412)

A conceptual amendment (Exhibit E) was discussed and presented during the bill hearing that would change the effective date of certain sections of the bill to July 1, 2027, which is the start of FY 2027-2028, effectively moving the fiscal impact out a biennium. There would be no fiscal impact for the upcoming biennium. If the committee wishes to move this bill, the appropriate action would be to amend and do pass as amended with the conceptual amendment presented during the bill hearing.

SENATOR TITUS:
Here again we are moving the effective date of this. We just heard a bill that we had passed with all good intentions which ultimately cost us a lot of money. This particular bill, we have some assurance that these folks that are on Medicaid qualify for that 90:10 that we heard testified by the director. Even though we do not quite know what this is going to cost us, I am a firm believer that these kinds of programs save the State's dollars, so I will be supporting this.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I agree. I am very supportive of this. We can differentiate this from some of the other bills that have a later start date. In talking to Administrator Stacie Weeks, it will take some time to put together this waiver. I think what they are doing in the City of Las Vegas is innovative. Ultimately, I think it does save a lot of money in the long run for these Medicaid patients. It will save our state dollars anyways.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
My understanding is that this is a little bit different because it is going to take that time to do that waiver before it would even really be able to kick in. This, to me, feels different than extending a date just to avoid a fiscal note or to

come back hoping the money is there. This is going to take time to get that waiver approved.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I would ditto ditto.

> SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 54.
>
> SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go to Senate Bill 378.

MR. THORLEY:
Senate Bill 378 revises provisions relating to health care. It was heard in this committee on May 16, 2025. It was presented by Senator Doñate. There was testimony in support from the MGM Resort, Caesar's Entertainment, the Nevada Resort Association and MD2. There was testimony in opposition to this bill from the Nevada Hospital Association, HCA Health Care, Healthy Nevada, Dignity Health, Saint Rose Dominican, Nevada Health System, Renown Health and Intermountain Health. There was no testimony in neutral.

SENATE BILL 378 (1st Reprint): Makes revisions relating to health care. (BDR 40-705)

A conceptual amendment was proposed and discussed during the bill hearing. Based on that conceptual amendment, Nevada Medicaid provided updated cost projections. There will be no General Fund costs in FY 2025-2026 and, in FY 2026-2027, there will be approximately $291,000. For the General Fund portion, there would also be authorized federal funds that came along with that.

A fiscal note was submitted by the Division of Public and Behavioral Health that would impact one of their budget accounts that is primarily federally and fee funded from licensing fees and receives very little General Fund money.

If the committee wishes to move this bill with the conceptual amendment that was presented during the bill hearing and to add General Fund monies to address the FY 2026-2027 fiscal impact of $291,000, the appropriate motion would be to amend and do pass as amended with the conceptual amendment, the General Fund appropriation and the authorization of added federal funds.

SENATOR TITUS:
I cannot support the amendment. I cannot support this bill. From a fiscal note, the $291,000 we cannot afford. I will address the policy if I get a chance. Hopefully I will not have to address the policy because it does not get there, but if it does, I will address the policy on the floor.

> SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 378.
>
> SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS BUCK, STONE AND TITUS VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will now entertain Senate Bill 316.

MR. THORLEY:
Senate Bill 316 received prior action from this committee. After the action was taken, there has been additional discussion on a necessary amendment.

SENATE BILL 316 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to insurance. (BDR 57-777)

SENATOR NGUYEN:
This has been a dynamic process in trying to come up with some amended language. The Legal Division was starting to work on the amended language as it came out of this committee earlier this week. Rather than doing a floor amendment having them start over on amendments, I have a draft of a proposed amendment (Exhibit F). This is not a legal draft prepared by the Legal Division; this was prepared by myself.

This amendment deletes section 16.5. My intent in doing that was to … I had heard some of the opposition testimony to this bill. Some of the other amendments attempt to get at the goal of preventing unfair business practices by pharmacy benefit managers (PBM) and health plans that drive up those profit margins that result in higher costs for consumers and the State.

Section 15 adds a new prohibition on spread pricing for the market. Spread pricing is a practice where PBMs charge payers more than they pay pharmacies for medications. This leads to some inflated drug costs and financial strain for the market and consumers.

Section 18 adds new penalties for noncompliance with the requirements for this bill that would be defined and imposed by the Commissioner of Insurance. There are no fiscal changes. The Division of Insurance … those costs were already included as we work sessioned this before. There are no changes to any of those sections.

There is a new section, marked in the proposed amendment as "section XX," which requires the commissioner, in coordination with the director of Nevada Medicaid, to review and approve contracts between PBMs and health plans prior to execution to ensure compliance with the bill and that the PBMs have limits on administrative fees applied by PBMs to control for unfair practices and cost drivers in the market for drug costs.

This section also allows for the commissioner to charge for an operations fee on PBMs and requires PBMs to use new value-based purchasing arrangements on high costs drugs that can allow for shared savings and profit sharing.

That is the intention behind this amendment Exhibit F. Rather than having the Legal Division draft the previous amendment only to do another floor amendment with these amendments, that is my intention. I see this as a dynamic process as we move through these houses.

There was an amendment that was not included that we would like to add back in. That is the copay accumulator language that was in the draft as it came into the Senate Committee on Finance. We would like to add that back.

There was some language that was presented on behalf of Delta Dental in section 1 that we would like to amend that removes dental organizations. They

seem to be included in this, but they do not do this type of work. This would remove them from this section as they are not in compliance with that section anyway.

SENATOR TITUS:
It does not pertain to them.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
That is exactly what it is. I would be asking for a motion to rescind the previous amend and do pass and then after that, for a new motion to amend and do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO RESCIND THE PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN ON S.B. 316.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 316, AS PREVIOUSLY STATED IN THE CONCEPTUAL AMENDMENT EXHIBIT F PRESENTED IN THIS HEARING, AS WELL AS THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOUT ADDING BACK THE LANGUAGE PREVIOUSLY INCLUDED AROUND THE COPAY ACCUMULATOR LANGUAGE AND REMOVING THE DENTAL PROVISIONS.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We are going to work session Senate Bill 393.

MR. THORLEY:
Senate Bill 393 was presented yesterday by Senator Neal. It revises the Windsor Park Environmental Justice Act. There was a conceptual amendment proposed and discussed yesterday during Senator Neal's testimony. However, there has been one change to the conceptual amendment from what was discussed yesterday. That change would be to add a General Fund appropriation of $26 million to the Nevada Department of Business and Industry, Housing Division for purposes of the Windsor Park project. This cost was discussed by Senator Neal yesterday in her testimony.

SENATE BILL 393 (1st Reprint): Revises the Windsor Park Environmental Justice Act. (BDR S-701)

There was testimony in support from the Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter. There was no testimony in opposition or neutral. If the committee wishes to move this bill with the conceptual amendment presented, including the $26 million General Fund appropriation, the appropriate action would be to amend and do pass as amended.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 393.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR TITUS:
I appreciate Senator Neal's decades-long dedication to this community and this effort. However, in all good conscience, when we have limited finances, to move that amount of money from the General Fund at this time when they still have $16 million in American Rescue Plan Act funds that have not been spent yet, I think this is incredibly fiscally irresponsible. I will be a no.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS BUCK AND TITUS VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no public comment, this hearing is adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jacob Anderson,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair

DATE:

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	**Exhibit Letter**	**Introduced on Minute Report Page No.**	**Witness / Entity**	**Description**
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
S.B. 76	C	2	Gabriel Di Chiara / Office of the Secretary of State	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 407	D	5	Senator Melanie Scheible	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 54	E	18	Wayne Thorley / LCB	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 316	F	20	Senator Rochelle Nguyen	Proposed Amendment