MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Eighty-third Session
May 29, 2025

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Marilyn Dondero Loop at 8:55 a.m. on Thursday, May 29, 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 Melanie Scheible
Senator Dina Neal
Senator Angela D. Taylor
Senator Carrie Ann Buck
Senator Robin L. Titus
Senator Jeff Stone

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Venicia Considine, Assembly District No. 18
Assemblymember Selena Torres-Fossett, Assembly District No. 3
Assemblymember Linda F. Hunt, Assembly District No. 17
Assemblymember Jovan A. Jackson, Assembly District No. 6
Assemblymember PK O'Neill, Assembly District No. 40
Assemblymember David Orentlicher, Assembly District No. 20
Assemblymember Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Wayne Thorley, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Cathy Crocket, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
John Kucera, Principal Program Fiscal Analyst
Madison Ryan, Remote Program Analyst
Marie Bell, Committee Staff Manager
Jacob Anderson, Committee Secretary
Virginia Weitzel, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jessica Padrón, AARP Nevada
Jacqueline Nguyen, Nevada State Medical Association
Patrick Kelly, President, Nevada Hospital Association
James Dzurenda, Director, Nevada Department of Corrections
James T. Simpson, Major, Highway Patrol Division, Nevada Department of Public Safety
Denny J. Gortari, Administrative Service Officer, Highway Patrol Division, Nevada Department of Public Safety
Alfonso N. Lopez, Sheet Metal and Air Rail Transportation Workers
Wendy Colborne, Chief of Staff, Building and Construction Trades Council of Northern Nevada
Carlos Hernandez, Nevada State AFL-CIO
Alexis Motarex, Associated General Contractors, Nevada Chapter
Mac Bybee, Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc., Nevada Chapter
Warren Hardy, Nevada Urban Consortium; SA Recycling; Nevada Pic-A-Part
Miranda Hoover, National Electrical Contractors Association, Northern Nevada Division
Ann Barnett, CEO, Nevada Contractors Association
Anahit Baghshetsyan, Policy Analyst, Nevada Policy Research Institute
Adam Plain, Insurance Regulation Liaison, Division of Insurance, Nevada Department of Business and Industry
Lea Cartwright, American Property Casualty Insurance Association
Jesse Wadhams, Nevada Insurance Council
Wiz Rouzard, Americans for Prosperity Nevada
Gregory Kerr, Vice Chair, Community Associations Institute; Legislative Action Committee, Nevada Chapter
Mark Coolman

Ronda Theisen
Mindy Martinez
Garrett Gordon, Community Associations Institute, Nevada Chapter
Ardea Canepa-Rotoli, Nevada Justice Association
Helen Foley, T-Mobile
Shelly Capurro, Charter Communications
Ashley Kennedy, Clark County
Mo Denis, Las Vegas Recycling
Joe Harrington, Communications Director, Nevada Department of Transportation
Rique Robb, Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services
Samantha Jayme, Health Program Manager, Autism Treatment Assistance Program, Aging and Disability Services Division, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services
Leann McAllister, Executive Director, American Academy of Pediatrics, Nevada Chapter
Steven Cohen
Tiffany Greenameyer, Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor
Dave Cochran, President, Nevada Fire Chief Association; Fire Chief, City of Reno
Nic Ciccone, City of Reno
Todd Ingalsbee, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada
Joelle Gutman Dodson, Northern Nevada Public Health
Kaylah Maese, ACLU of Nevada
Joanna Jacob, Clark County
Sarah Adler, Nevada Opioid Treatment Association
Jonathan Norman, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Paloma Guerrero, Clark County Public Defender's Office
Ryan Vortisch, Silver State Voices
Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Research and Project Manager, Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles
Shannon Litz, Deputy Director, Programs, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services
Bill Brewer, Executive Director, Nevada Rural Housing Authority
Mendy Elliott, Flynn Giudici Government Affairs
Jerri Williams Conrad, Reno Housing Authority
Homa Sayyar, Deputy Director, Nevada Department of Indigent Defense Services
Lesley Pittman, Waterford Institute

Celestena Glover, Executive Officer, Public Employees' Benefits Program
Keiko Duncan, Pharmacy Director, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services
Primo Castro, State Government Affairs Director, Biotechnology Innovation Organization
Kyle Piccola, Director of State Policy, Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America
Olivia Tanager, Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter
Jaina Moan, Nevada External Affairs Director, The Nature Conservancy
Vinson Guthreau, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties
Caleb Cage, Eureka County
Sheila Bray, Director of Government and Community Engagement, University of Nevada, Reno

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 282.

ASSEMBLY BILL 282 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to billing for health care. (BDR 40-785)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER DAVID ORENTLICHER (Assembly District No. 20):
Assembly Bill 282 is designed to ensure that patients receive refunds when they overpay their hospitals, doctors or other healthcare providers. The need for this bill arises because we have health insurance, and things are complex, and there are delays in payment. Sometimes doctors and hospitals are told when they calculate the patient's coshare that the copayment for the share of the patient is higher than it should be. The patient overpays and the hospital provider ultimately gets paid by the insurer and realizes they overbilled the patient.

Unfortunately, as I learned from former Assemblymember Ellen Spiegel, who preceded me in Assembly District 20, the provider does not always refund the overpayment. It took her months to recover over $1,000. This bill says you have to pay. The reason why I am here is during the discussion with stakeholders, we added provisions to pay interest to the patient. To do that triggered a fiscal note. It is not important. The stakeholder who suggested that supports taking it out. The fine will still be there but not the [interest] payment. This is section 2, subsection 6 and section 3, subsections 8 and 9, which provide for the payment of interest to the patient who was overcharged. Those will come out, and that is why we have a fiscal note.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
My own deceased mother got $1,000 refund three years after she was deceased. It continues to sit in unclaimed property. It happens because we were so quick to pay bills, I guess. Would you just review that amendment (Exhibit C) again really quick? I see that it is to delete sections 2, subsection 6 and section 3, subsection 8 through 9. Is that correct?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER ORENTLICHER:
Yes. Section 2, subsection 6 is the one that assesses or deducts from the fine interest payments if a medical facility is involved. That is for the hospitals and other facilities. Section 3, subsections 8 and 9, is for a doctor, nurse or another individual provider or their group that does not refund the payment. Subsections 8 and 9 of section 3 deal with the calculation and payment of interest.

JESSICA PADRÓN (AARP Nevada):
I am testifying in support of A.B. 282. As you know, we have long advocated for policies that protect patients, promote transparency in health care and ensure financial fairness, especially for older adults and those living with chronic illnesses. We believe A.B. 282 aligns with these priorities. We are looking forward to medical providers identifying and correcting billing errors and notifying patients of discrepancies and of course, issuing those refunds in a timely manner, not several years later as the Chair noted. We are very enthusiastic for this bill, and we hope we can count on your support and get it passed out.

JACQUELINE NGUYEN (Nevada State Medical Association):
I am here because there's a little confusion this morning in speaking with the Assemblymember. There was an amendment that was handed to me last week that somehow the Assemblymember did not get, or it was never filed. I just want to be clear that we support the idea of patients being able to get refunds in a timely manner. I really want to thank the Assemblymember for being very willing to work with us on things. The main issue we had originally was that we needed to make clear a billing entity definition was added, because in many instances, especially for our employed doctors, they have no hand in the billing at all. For them to be assessed the fine versus the actual employer or the billing entity was something that we needed to solve. Why we are here though, was because of that interest. That is what triggered the fiscal note. The amendment

would have taken care of that. I think then he would have bypassed this committee. We just wanted to acknowledge that.

The final thing that I needed to get on the record was one of the things that we had agreed upon was that nothing in this would be referred to the Board of Medical Examiners (BME). Anytime something is filed with the BME, an investigation is opened, and a physician has to then get representation and report that investigation to all the credentialing entities. We just did not want a physician to have to do that over a billing error. We will continue to work with the Assemblymember, but I needed that on the record.

PATRICK KELLY (President, Nevada Hospital Association):
We want to thank the bill sponsor for working with us. We do share the concerns about the amendments, but they seem to be on track, so things are looking good.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We'll close the hearing on A.B. 282 and open the hearing on A.B. 570.

ASSEMBLY BILL 570 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Department of Corrections for various purposes relating to certain technology, training and equipment. (BDR S-1204)

JAMES DZURENDA (Director, Nevada Department of Corrections):
Assembly Bill 570, section 1, asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the prison medical care budget account for the replacement of medical and dental equipment in the following sums: fiscal year (FY) 2025-2026, $324,664 and FY 2026-2027, $39,939.

Section 2 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Office of the Director's budget account for the replacement of vehicles for FY 2025-2026 in the amount of $5,154,386 and FY 2026-2027, $43,446.

Section 3 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Office of the Director budget account for the replacement of equipment related to information technologies, network and systems in the following sums: $161,526 in FY 2025-2026 and $133,153 in FY 2026-2027.

Section 5 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Office of the Director budget account for the sum of $225,750 for the replacement of refrigerator trucks, garbage trucks and a dump truck.

Section 6 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Office of the Director budget account for the sum of $123,308 for the replacement of office chairs and furniture for an executive office.

Section 7 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to Department of Corrections for the Office of the Director budget account for the sum of $2,861,657 for the replacement of passenger buses and purchase of transport vans.

Section 8 asks for appropriation from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Office of the Director budget account for the sum of $103,347 for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software.

Section 9 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Office of the Director budget for the sum of $1,313,733 for equipment and training for correctional officers.

Section 10 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Correctional Programs budget account for the sum of $71,604 for the replacement of office chairs.

Section 12 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Office of the Director budget account for the sum of $341,630 for the replacement of hardware, software and equipment for information technology servers.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
How often do you have to replace vehicles or dump trucks?

MR. DZURENDA:
I do not know how other agencies are, but our fleet is extremely dilapidated. The majority of our vehicles are over 200,000 [miles]. We have Prison Industries which helps us to rebuild the vehicles, so that's probably why we

keep them longer. They rebuild the engines and do a lot of work on them to keep them going longer. I think our least mileage on our transport buses that bring high security into the communities have 450,000 miles on it. We have rarely replaced our vehicles, and it is about time before something disastrous happens.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I was thinking in my mind because you have to come to us, is it years or is it miles? It is probably a little of both.

MR. DZURENDA:
Yes, it is.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Hearing none in support, opposition or neutral, we will close the hearing on A.B. 570 and open the hearing on A.B. 572.

ASSEMBLY BILL 572: Makes appropriations to the Department of Corrections for the replacement and purchase of certain equipment and furniture. (BDR S-1206)

MR. DZURENDA:
Assembly Bill 572, section 1, asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Pioche Conservation Camp budget account for the purchase of small equipment in the following sums: FY 2025-2026, $317 and again in 2026-2027, $317.

Section 2 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Jean Conservation Camp budget account for the purchases of small equipment in the following sums: FY 2025-2026, $1,590 and again for FY 2026-2027, $1,590.

Section 3 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Carlin Conservation Camp budget account for the purchases of small equipment in the following sums: FY 2025-2026, $3,786 and again in FY 2026-2027, $3,786.

Section 4 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Stewart Conservation Camp budget account for the sum of $59,240 for the replacement of a dishwasher.

Section 5 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Pioche Conservation Camp budget account for the sum of $38,503 for the replacement of laundry equipment.

Section 6 asks for appropriations for the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Three Lakes Valley Conservation Camp budget account for the sum of $31,384 for the replacement of propane water heaters.

Section 7 asks for appropriations for the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Jean Conservation Camp budget account for the sum of $160,610 for the replacement of office chairs and laundry equipment.

Section 8 asks for appropriations for the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the Carlin Conservation Camp budget account for the sum of $31,616 for the replacement of boilers.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
When you say small equipment, what is small equipment?

MR. DZURENDA:
The small equipment for the conservation camps was a three-year average of what was needed for equipment that is related to maintenance.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I am just going to guess right now, do you mean screwdrivers, hammers, wrenches, things to use for maintenance?

MR. DZURENDA:
Those usually don't break down, but it is usually motors. Usually, small equipment as in drills.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I was just trying to figure it out because of the $317, I am wondering what is it that we're purchasing for that amount? This shows that we are used to big

numbers. I think I need a job as a dishwasher if we are buying $59,000 dishwashers. Can I sign up as your dishwasher?

MR. DZURENDA:
Some of our dishwashers are in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. They are dishwashers that are allowed to wash over three shifts of 5,000 offenders at once. You are talking 15,000 dishes that go through the washing machine every day.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
So, they aren't your classic Whirlpool.

Hearing none in support, opposition or neutral we'll close the hearing on A.B. 572 and open the hearing on A.B. 574.

ASSEMBLY BILL 574: Makes appropriations to the Department of Corrections for the purchase and replacement of equipment and furniture at High Desert State Prison. (BDR S-1209)

MR. DZURENDA:
Assembly Bill 574, section 1 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the sum of $57,742 for the High Desert State Prison budget account for the purchase of security and safety equipment.

Section 2 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the sum of $80,981 for the High Desert State Prison budget account for the replacement of automotive equipment.

Section 3 is asking for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the sum of $36,345 for the High Desert State Prison budget account for the replacement of culinary equipment.

Section 4 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the High Desert State Prison budget account for the replacement of security equipment in the following sums: FY 2025-2026, $62,708 and in FY 2026-2027, $23,289.

Section 5 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to Department of Corrections for the High Desert State budget account for the replacement of warehouse and culinary equipment in the following sums: FY 2025-2026, $495,706 and FY 2026-2027, $1,965.

Section 6 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the High Desert State Prison budget account for the replacement of medical equipment in the following sums: FY 2025-2026, $20,410 and again in 2026-2027, $20,410.

Section 7 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the High Desert State Prison budget account for the replacement of laundry equipment in the following sums: FY 2025-2026, $1,083,520 and FY 2026-2027, $19,992.

Section 8 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the High Desert State Prison budget account for the replacement of office furniture and visiting room chairs in the following sums: FY 2025-2026, $71,840 and FY 2026-2027, $5,200.

Section 9 asks for appropriations from the State General Fund to the Department of Corrections for the High Desert State Prison budget account for smaller equipment purchases in the following sums: FY 2025-2026, $13,870 and FY 2026-2027 for the same $13,870.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I have a question on the office furniture. Several of your bills have office furniture in them. How old is the office furniture? Is that something that you can flex on at all or is that something that is needed?

MR. DZURENDA:
I do not have ages, but as we go, we do as many repairs as possible. We have a prison industry that repairs them until the point where it becomes dangerous to use and have in an office. That is all we go by. We do not go by age. When prison industry says it is too much or we can't repair any further, then we ask for new furniture.

SENATOR STONE:
Regarding section 5, $495,000 for warehouse and culinary equipment, can you elaborate on what that $495,000 is for?

MR. DZURENDA:
Those are for warmer heaters for trays, and we're also asking for rice steamers, cookers and boilers that we use every day in the kitchens but are no longer working.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Hearing none in support, opposition or neutral, we will close the hearing on A.B. 574 and open the hearing on A.B. 576.

ASSEMBLY BILL 576: Makes appropriations to the Nevada Highway Patrol Division of the Department of Public Safety for the purchase and replacement of motorcycles, vehicles and equipment. (BDR S-1214)

JAMES T. SIMPSON (Major, Highway Patrol Division, Nevada Department of Public Safety):
I am here to present A.B. 576 that makes one-shot appropriations to the Nevada Highway Patrol Division of the Department of Public Safety for the purchase and replacement of motorcycles, vehicles and equipment. The one-shot appropriations total $18,865,045 in funds for the following items:

Section 1 is the replacement of fleet motorcycles and associated special equipment. Section 2 is replacement of portable radios and associated equipment. Section 3 is a replacement of vehicle hoists, a forklift and trailers.

Section 4 is replacement of drones and scales for commercial motor vehicles. Section 5 is to purchase first aid kits. Section 6 is a purchase of electronic flares.

Section 7 is the purchase of equipment and associated ammunition. Section 8 is a purchase of storage containers. Section 9 states that we can't commit the money after June 30, 2027, and not spend it after September 17, 2027. We plan on spending this July 2, so that will not be an issue.

Section 10 is to replace fleet vehicles and associated special equipment. Section 11 is a replacement of mobile data computers and associated

equipment. Section 12 is replacement of portable event recording devices or body-worn cameras. Sections 10, 11 and 12 are for each year, so those have to be dealt with before September 2026 and September 2027.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
How often do you purchase vehicles? Do you purchase them based on mileage? How does that work?

DENNY J. GORTARI (Administrative Service Officer, Highway Patrol Division, Nevada Department of Public Safety):
We follow *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) 1316 when replacing vehicles. This stipulates that sedans will be replaced at 100,000 miles, pickups and SUVs at 125,000 miles or 10 years. We follow that guidance. To add to that, in terms of law enforcement, our vehicles have a lot of engine wear on them. You're going to get another 60,000 or 70,000 miles of engine wear in addition to that. At the same time, once we're done with the vehicles, we turn them into the excess property unit, and they are sold off and those funds get returned to the Highway Fund. We get residuals that are pretty good if they are in decent shape. I have seen residuals as high as $10,000 that get returned to the Highway Fund.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I will also ask about the first aid kits. Obviously, that is something you need dealing with accidents and things that you may do. How many does that purchase? You do not need to give me an exact number, but what kind of usage? In other words, if you buy 100, do you use all 100 or 75, and maybe there are 25 sitting there somewhere?

MR. SIMPSON:
This enhancement does fund the purchase of individual first aid kits for the issuance to all Nevada Higher Patrol sworn staff. It contains a number of items, whether it be clotting kits if somebody were to be shot, and other basic first aid equipment. The issue is the lifespan of this equipment. You can't just leave them in your car for 15 years. The heat and the cold does wear on it, and we do have to purchase every few years.

SENATOR TITUS:
Since you were asking about these first aid kits, do they all contain Narcan?

MR. SIMPSON:
They do not contain Narcan—though we do receive Narcan through the university, I think through a grant. We have replaced ours every time the replacement cycle happens, and they've been extremely beneficial to us. We have used them, and they have made a difference.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Hearing no one in support, opposition or neutral, I will close the hearing on A.B. 576 and open the hearing on A.B. 213.

ASSEMBLY BILL 213 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing public works projects. (BDR 28-816)

ALFONSO N. LOPEZ (Sheet Metal and Air Rail Transportation Workers):
We are here just to address the fiscal note that was put on in the end as undetermined. We have been working with all the stakeholders from day one. The Labor Commissioner has been very cooperative with all the different stakeholders' meetings throughout this process. We are here to answer any questions you may have.

WENDY COLBORNE (Chief of Staff, Building and Construction Trades Council of Northern Nevada):
We are in strong support of this bill.

CARLOS HERNANDEZ (Nevada State AFL-CIO):
We are in full support of A.B. 213.

ALEXIS MOTAREX (Associated General Contractors, Nevada Chapter):
I am here today opposed to A.B. 213. This expansion of prevailing wage will result in one of two things that will impact the fiscal wellbeing of this State. Either public works projects will become more expensive, resulting in less value to the taxpayer and fewer jobs created because there will be fewer projects or Nevadans will lose their jobs. In order for Nevada contractors to remain competitive, they will outsource the custom fabricated items on projects and lay off those currently performing that work in their shops. Additionally, this will limit workforce development with the entry-level positions for people beginning their careers in HVAC and plumbing as a helper.

Helpers are specifically prohibited from working on prevailing wage jobs. The contractor's use of helpers provides the training necessary as preapprenticeship and familiarizes them with the requirements of that craft. There are already tremendous workforce challenges for a variety of reasons, and this bill would only compound the problem. There is far too much risk with the passage of this bill that is trying to fix a problem that simply does not exist. Because of that, we respectfully ask that you not process a bill that puts Nevada jobs at peril.

MAC BYBEE (Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc., Nevada Chapter):
Our concern echoes my colleague from Associated General Contractors. The NAC 338 specifically excludes fabrication for a reason—because the compliance burden and the regulatory burden is incredibly high, and this is how prevailing wage in the NAC has existed for decades. That is our greatest concern, the compliance burden on the employers, but certainly there will be a regulatory burden on the State.

WARREN HARDY (Nevada Urban Consortium; SA Recycling; Nevada Pic-A-Part):
We are very concerned about the fiscal impact of this on local governments as well as the State. More importantly than that, this is an issue we have been dealing with for a number of years to try to figure out. We just don't know how we can enforce this. The amount of personnel that would be required to go on every job site to determine that the fabricated item was created in Nevada is a regulatory burden that we don't even know where to start to do. For that reason, we have a lot of concerns about this bill.

MIRANDA HOOVER (National Electrical Contractors Association, Northern Nevada Division):
We echo all of our colleagues here in the opposition standpoint specifically for the fiscal reasons that were already stated.

ANN BARNETT (CEO, Nevada Contractors Association):
I am here representing the construction industry in Southern Nevada. The Nevada Contractors Association opposes A.B. 213. While we do support prevailing wage on public works, this bill would require it at permanent offsite facilities that serve both public and private projects. We believe this expansion creates logistical and economic challenges in determining what qualifies as prevailing wage work, especially across different jurisdictions. This would lead to increased costs for both state and local governments.

ANAHIT BAGHSHETSYAN (Policy Analyst, Nevada Policy Research Institute):
Today we come in strong opposition of A.B. 213. This bill does everything that everyone before me mentioned. The compliance burdens and the regulatory burdens are very heavy, and it will be hard to address. Above all, the fiscal impact of this bill goes far beyond the fiscal note that is presented. The increased cost would be passed on to the taxpayers and the business owners. This inflation of cost is just something that would, in the long run, harm business and the economy. For those reasons, we urge your opposition on this measure.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will close the hearing on A.B. 213 and open the hearing on A.B. 376.

ASSEMBLY BILL 376 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to insurance. (BDR 57-1009)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER PK O'NEILL (Assembly District No. 40):
Assembly Bill 376 addresses an urgent and important matter facing homeowners, not only in my district but throughout the State—homeowners insurance. As you're aware, many housing developments in Nevada sit squarely within the wildland urban interface which is just a fancy way of saying they're in the transitional space between the forest and developed land. One of the risks in the interface is wildland fires.

Many Nevadans are facing the cancellation of their homeowners' insurance policies. Others are trying to purchase homes and cannot close a deal as they cannot find an insurance company willing to underwrite their homeowners' policies. Others are facing skyrocketing premiums and cannot afford their coverage. This issue is not unique to Nevada and is indeed a nationwide problem.

In working with representatives from the Division of Insurance and the insurance industry, we are offering an amendment that has now been put into A.B. 376 to address the homeowners' insurance availability.

As of this morning, we are working on another amendment that will be addressing the concerns that the homeowners' associations (HOAs) have, as well as adding Senator Buck as a cosponsor to the bill. Hopefully, we may even have that conceptual amendment before we finish presenting A.B. 376.

ADAM PLAIN (Insurance Regulation Liaison, Division of Insurance, Nevada Department of Business and Industry):
Assembly Bill 376 has a few different provisions in it. The first of which is contained in sections 1 through 20 of the bill to create an insurance regulatory sandbox environment, allowing insurance companies to come up with creative and innovative insurance products and apply to the Commissioner of Insurance for approval of those products. The language is taken primarily from the National Council on Insurance Legislatures as model language. We did tighten it up a little bit and increased some consumer protection provisions within the sandbox proposal, such that an insurer could request an exemption from certain insurance regulations but in no circumstances could request to be exempted from a general regulatory authority, consumer protections and the Unfair Trade Practices Act.

This would hopefully allow insurers to write new kinds of products that would allow them to get coverage to consumers who are not currently able to get coverage for wildfire reasons. Section 20.3 of the bill would institute a program of flex rating which would give the commissioner authority to establish a flex rating threshold whereby homeowners and property insurers could have very modest rate increases and bypass the traditional rate review process in an effort to speed support to the industry in modest amounts. Anything above the approved rate review threshold would still go through our full prior approval rate review process.

Section 25.1 of the bill would allow insurers to carve out and issue separate wildfire policies or riders similar to what homeowners can currently do for items like earthquake or flood insurance. Hopefully, this would allow consumers who could not otherwise get insurance to at least get coverage for all of those other nonwildfire perils and still be able to shop around for something to supplement that.

Section 25.2 deals with reciprocal insurers. Reciprocals are kind of like a mutual insurer in that they are not owned by a stock company; they are owned by the policyholders. Section 25.2 would give some extra specificity to the solvency standards for reciprocals. We do have some reciprocals who are interested in entering the State and they've requested that we put a little bit more detail around what their solvency standards would be.

Sections 25.4 through 25.5 deal with captive insurers. Captive insurers are traditionally specialized insurers owned by a corporation to ensure that corporations' interests or HOAs are not currently allowed to participate in captive insurance. We would propose to expand that so HOAs could participate in captive insurance as a potential backstop when they can't find other coverage.

Sections 25.6 and 25.7 deal with HOAs and common-interest communities. There's a clause that requires the HOA to cover all the aspects of the common building. We are proposing to relax that. This is a section where we have had some discussion with the HOAs and other interested parties because I have been in front of many committees this session talking about unintended consequences in health policy. We had some unintended consequences in HOA policy here. This is the section where we are working on a conceptual amendment to make sure that we do not trigger any unforeseen circumstances.

The most important thing to mention is that the bill will require some regulatory lift by the Division of Insurance. We intend to make sure that, for example, consumer protections and disclosures are encompassed in those regulations. I would also mention that the sandbox provisions within the bill do have an explicit expiration date. It is intended to be an experiment. If after four years, the experiment is succeeding, the Legislature can elect to reup it. If after four years, the experiment is not succeeding, they will expire automatically.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
You referenced a couple times an amendment. I did not know if there were several amendments or just one? When will we see it?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'NEILL:
There's just one. That is what was referred to in the part dealing with the unintended consequences of the HOAs and also adding Senator Buck as cosponsor. You'll see it is as soon as I have it, and I have set a noon deadline for this because I know the urgency and the way that you work. Even at noontime, I am stretching your kindness.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
It's 9:48 a.m., so you've got an hour and 10 minutes.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'NEILL:
Legal was in the office with us and are working on something as we speak. They said it would just take 30 minutes or so.

SENATOR TITUS:
I think this is much needed. My district has been hit by these wildfires, and it has been an issue. My question is regarding your statement on the end day and determining whether it is successful. What are the benchmarks that you will use? Is it more houses insured? Less people being turned down? What's the benchmark?

MR. PLAIN:
The sandbox provisions actually require an insurer who's applying to participate to set their own benchmarks of what the successful test program will look like. Because of the flexibility of the sandbox program, they might choose, for example, an innovative product design. They would say, "We are going to offer this type of new product that has not been offered before and as part of our test, the insurance company, we want to look at these metrics—what's the uptake within the population? Does it relieve our surplus capacity concerns? Do we have a claims frequency under this new product?" That's all part of the application they would submit to us.

When the Division of Insurance receives and reviews those applications, at the end of those four years when we come back to the legislative body, we would be able to say, "These are the types of applications we received, these were their metrics, and this is how they performed against those metrics."

SENATOR TITUS:
Once those have been established, then it will be up to the Division of Insurance to come back to the legislative process for the oversight to say, "Hey, this is what we think we have achieved," so you'll report back to the Legislature.

MR. PLAIN:
Yes, absolutely.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I think I was just waiting for the additional language that you're working on. The chair has asked my question, and you answered it as well.

LEA CARTWRIGHT (American Property Casualty Insurance Association):
I really want to thank you for hearing this bill this morning and also to the sponsor, Assemblymember O'Neill, for his continuous work on this proposal. This has been not just a session project, but we have been working on how to address the wildfire issue and the insurance issue through quarterly meetings with the property casualty group at the Division of Insurance; stakeholder meetings between consumer protection folks, the industry, the regulators and hour-long hearings in Incline Village to talk about the HOA issues. This has been an ongoing discussion, and we are so thrilled to have this bill before you today. I know there is a minor change coming.

JESSE WADHAMS (Nevada Insurance Council):
I will just simply say, what she said.

MS. BAGHSHETSYN:
Today, we [Nevada Policy] come in strong support of A.B. 376 to establish a regulatory sandbox for property insurers. Nevada has one of the top ten most complex regulatory statutes in the nation, making it difficult, particularly for insurance businesses, to enter the market, test new products and implement innovation.

By allowing insurers to innovate while also maintaining consumer protections under the oversight of the Commissioner of Insurance, this bill kind of strikes a balance between innovation and oversight, and in the process helps those who need the property insurance the most up north. I think above all, the insurance policies could also be innovated under this policy; innovative models could include peer-to-peer insurance or AI and machine-learning applications as well as telematics-based policies. Not only would it change the construction of the premiums, but it would also change the nature of it, potentially.

States such as Kentucky, West Virginia, Utah and Vermont have successfully implemented sandboxes like this, and we stand to benefit from the similar policies. For those reasons, we urge your support on the measure.

WIZ ROUZARD (Americans for Prosperity Nevada):
In the interest of time, we ditto all the comments, and we really appreciate this innovation that is being proposed by the bill sponsors and stakeholders.

GREGORY KERR (Vice Chair, Community Associations Institute; Legislative Action Committee, Nevada Chapter):
I am an attorney representing HOAs since 2007, here representing Community Associations Institute (CAI), a nationwide trade organization around HOAs. As representative of the Legislative Action Committee (LAC) for the Nevada Chapter, my opposition is particular to section 25.6 and the conforming change in [section] 25.7. The opposition I had prepared hopefully would have had more thunder, but I don't think that it's entirely necessary. I just learned this morning, as Assemblymember O'Neill mentioned, my committee and lobbyist, Garrett Gordon, who I believe will also be providing some neutral testimony at this point, is working with Assemblymember O'Neill on an amendment. I'll be taking a look at that language, as well on behalf of the CAI and LAC.

I just want to note for the record that there are concerns with the deletion of the requirement for associations to carry property insurance over the units in projects where they have shared walls or horizontal and vertical boundaries, which are basically town home and condominium projects. Exposing owners to the liability and responsibility for those repairs will be far more onerous than the increases that a lot of associations are facing here in Nevada, which I am certainly well aware of. I have clients that regularly come to me with their increased property insurance premiums. What we don't want as an answer or response to that problem, is a bigger problem where there's going to be uninsured losses that the associations and homeowners are going to have to pay dollar-for-dollar through increased assessments.

I can tell you that especially with condominium projects, it is not uncommon for someone to leave their bathtub faucet on as they go to the grocery store, or install a new washing machine and they cross thread the washing machine supply water line, or flush a dirty diaper down a toilet, and that leads to backing up in other units on multiple floors, affecting multiple units. The damages can be over a million dollars these days.

We don't want those to go uninsured. We don't want owners and associations being exposed to that, and we don't want to lose the subrogation liability protection that currently exists in the law. If we remove the association's obligation to carry that insurance, we're exposing homeowners to potential subrogation claims as homeowner insurers fight between policies and coverages.

That said, we are working with Assemblymember O'Neill on an amendment that I think everybody will be happy with. I thank him for his efforts on that and for working with CAI and other representatives from our industry.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I appreciate that you came here and indicated your opposition to the bill. It just is my understanding that with the amendment proposed by the sponsor during the hearing it seems like your concerns are addressed. Is that your understanding?

MR. KERR:
My understanding of the amendment that is being drafted is that associations will still carry the responsibility under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 116.3013 to carry a property insurance policy on not just the common areas, but also the units. There will be a carveout to some degree relating to wildfire claims.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Do you have opposition to the amendment as proposed?

MR. KERR:
I haven't seen the amendment. I don't have reason to oppose it at this time. My opposition was initially to what is in section 25.6 and 25.7 as written in the draft you have in front of you.

MARK COOLMAN:
I am a homeowner in Las Vegas. I am also an insurance agent for NFP Property and Casualty Services. My insurance practice is primarily HOAs. I am the agent for approximately 600 HOAs in Southern Nevada. At the present time, I oppose the bill on the grounds of sections 25.6 and 25.7. However, if the new amendment is what Mr. Kerr discussed, then of course I would support the bill.

I just want to reiterate that I have personally been involved in many claims where an attached unit is on fire and the owner did not have insurance and then the association and the other owners had to deal with basically an unsellable building of any unit for the members. Approximately eight years ago, that was changed in the law, and we spent the last eight years making sure that all these developments are insured. If we would release them of the burden of insuring, many associations, because they are managed by individuals will simply look at

price, not at whether they are covered or not, and we would have the nightmare that we legislated against many years ago.

RONDA THEISEN:
I am the president of a 100-unit condominium association in Reno that in October 2022 suffered more than $5 million in damages after a small kitchen fire on our top floor. We need to have master insurance policies in place. I don't know what this bill is going to end up looking like based on the discussion so far, but a couple of things I'd ask you to consider adding is to get rid of the ridiculous requirement that we have to prove gross negligence in order to recover against a responsible owner. Require condominium owners to carry HO6 policies and townhouse owners to carry HO3 policies with an amount sufficient to cover the master policy's deductible. Then, make it possible for us to collect the deductible from the responsible owners.

There are commonsense things you can do to help us reduce our burden. If somehow, some well-meaning board had canceled the master insurance policy because it was not required, our association would not have been crippled by the events of October 2022. We would have been destroyed with every one of our owners having to pony up $50,000 in special assessments to cover the damage caused by one accidental fire in one of our units. Let’s get this right.

MINDY MARTINEZ:
I am an insurance agent here in the State of Nevada specializing in insuring homeowners’ associations. My original call was to be in opposition only in reference to sections 25.6 and 25.7. My understanding is that there will be an amendment. In that case, if they remove the language of not requiring associations to ensure the building, then I will be in favor of the bill.

GARRETT GORDON (Community Associations Institute, Nevada Chapter):
I just want to thank Assemblymember O'Neill for working with us on the amendment. We are in support with the proposed amendment, and I will note for the record about the commentary in Las Vegas, as he had not seen the amendment yet. He also will be in support.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Okay, so you're in neutral now.

MR. GORDON:
I am neutral as the bill is currently written. I just got the amendment so we will be in support with the amendment.

ARDEA CANEPA-ROTOLI (Nevada Justice Association):
We came here this morning in opposition of this. We were fortunate to work with the related parties and Assemblymember O'Neill, and we were able, as has been mentioned many times, to come up with an amendment that will address the issues with consequences to homeowners' associations.

We did just receive the language for the amendment. I did want to make note that it says to amend section 25.6; it also needs to amend section 25.7 to make sure it addresses the issues with association insurance requirements. Otherwise, we are agreeable to the amendment that has been proposed.

At the Nevada Justice Association we're always concerned with consumer protection, so we did have some discussions about concerns that if an insurance policy is issued to a homeowner or association, that there be protections in place to make sure that they are made aware of the fact that the standard policy may not include wildfire coverage, and that wildfire coverage needs to be obtained by way of a separate rider. We have been assured that during the regulatory process, there will be things done to make sure there are some consumer protections in place. We are here as neutral.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Do I understand that you may have an amendment in your hands?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'NEILL:
We have delivered a copy of the amendment (Exhibit D) to the committee secretary for dispersal to you. Would you like me to read it to you?

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Please, sir.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'NEILL:
The first part is adding Senator Buck as a joint sponsor. The second amends section 25.6 of the bill to:

> … retain the provisions of subsection 2 which require the property insurance required to be maintained by a unit-owners' association on the common elements of the community, in the case of a building that contains units divided by certain boundaries, to include the units to the extent reasonably available. Instead, add a new language to the subsection that provides that:
>
> The requirement of the subsections do not apply if the association procures property insurance coverage that covers the peril of wildfire which coordinates or subrogates with the policies of individual units' owners that provide coverage for the peril of wildfire; and
>
> The provisions of the subsection do not relieve the unit-owners' association of any other legal responsibilities prescribed by the provisions of existing law governing unit-owners' associations.

That is the amendment as proposed. This is dealing with wildfires, not with a unit's issue. Not with a kitchen fire, a broken pipe, any of that. This is unit wildland fires which have ravaged both Northern Nevada and Southern Nevada who has issues in the Mount Charleston area and some others where we're starting to move out farther.

That has to be remembered, that it is wildland fires, and it is a sandbox to experiment to see what we can do because we have people losing their homes and not able to gain homes because of the challenge we have with the current fire.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
What does this do to the fiscal note with the Division of Insurance?

MR. PLAIN:
The fiscal note was removed at Reprint 1.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Is it still removed?

MR. PLAIN:
Yes, there should be no fiscal impact or fiscal note generated by the new amendment, Exhibit D.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I will close the hearing on A.B. 376 and open the hearing on A.B. 503.

ASSEMBLY BILL 503 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to governmental administration. (BDR 15-394)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER SELENA TORRES-FOSSETT (Assembly District No. 3):
I am here also as Chair of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs for the 2023-2024 Interim to present A.B. 503, which aims to address the unlawful possession of utility wire. This bill was introduced in response to a series of copper wire thefts that has impacted Nevadans. With the wrong set of circumstances, consequences of copper wire theft can cause more than a disturbance to electricity in our household; it can also have life-threatening consequences.

This bill was first discussed during the Interim Government Affairs Committee about a year ago, and it is a culmination of over a year's work in the combined efforts of local governments, law enforcement, public defenders, telecommunication companies, public utilities and the scrap metal industry.

At this time, I am going to go ahead and go through the sections of the bill. I would like to note, since I first reprinted the bill, the fiscal note from the Department of Corrections was removed on May 15. The Nevada Department of Transportation in Clark County even anticipates saving $2.4 million and $3.1 million respectively, each year of the biennium on which it would typically spend to repair damages caused by copper wire thefts and activities.

Section 1 defines critical infrastructure and establishes penalties for willful tampering with removing, damaging or destroying any critical infrastructure. The severity of the penalties is dependent on the value of the property affected and whether the act causes an interruption in service based on the value of the property.

Penalties can include: if it's less than $1,200, the person would be guilty of a misdemeanor; and if it's between $1,200 and $5,000, the person is guilty of a

gross misdemeanor; if it's $5,000 or more, the person is guilty of a Category D felony with a prison term of not less than one year, and not more than four years and a fine of not more than $5,000. If it causes an interruption of services provided by any critical infrastructure, a person is guilty of a Category C felony with a prison term of not less than one year, a maximum term of not more than five years and a fine of not more than $10,000.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Am I understanding all the fiscal notes have been removed?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER TORRES-FOSSETT:
Correct. There is no fiscal impact except for savings for the State.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I know you had a whole team that was working on this. I appreciate the conversations that we had early on in session to come up with some of those weight things. I think it makes it a good bill. Hopefully, this will lead to significant savings for our counties, cities, utilities and businesses. I know that this is a huge problem, and I appreciate your work on this.

SENATOR BUCK:
I love the bill. I know that this impacts schools. It impacts trails, especially in my district.

HELEN FOLEY (T-Mobile):
We'd like to thank the sponsor of the bill and everyone who was involved—local governments and the telecom industry. We think it's a very good bill now. It's been a serious problem—people stealing this type of equipment, not just the copper wire, but the infrastructure that allows us to make phone calls and everything else. We strongly support it.

SHELLY CAPURRO (Charter Communications):
This legislation is essential to safeguarding Nevada's critical infrastructure and ensuring uninterrupted delivery of vital communication services to residents, businesses and emergency responders. When we started working with the sponsor and Mr. Warren Hardy last year, I knew that there was some impact. I had no concept as to the impact, even on a safety issue, but also to our state agencies and to our local governments. I very much urge your support of this bill.

MR. HARDY:
Representing the Nevada Urban Consortium, Nevada Pic-A-Part and SA Recycling, this bill is the culmination of a lot of work. I think all of the local governments in Southern Nevada have now adopted an ordinance dealing with this issue. This is the conclusion of that, which makes it even more effective. The industry is in full support of this.

As you know, this has been a challenge in Southern Nevada. We based this conceptually on the catalytic converter law, which you adopted last session that Senator Nguyen sponsored, which has been phenomenally successful. It is a national model for how to deal with these kinds of thefts. This is a little bit different because it is not quite as clear cut and clean as catalytic converter theft, but this is an amazing bill and will lead the nation once again in dealing with these kinds of thefts.

ASHLEY KENNEDY (Clark County):
We testified in support during the policy committee as well. Over the course of three years, Clark County had about 850 locations that were subject to copper wire theft that resulted in 650,000 linear feet of wire that had to be replaced by Clark County. We submitted an unsolicited fiscal note to indicate the savings from our public works department. Every year we anticipate the savings of $1.5 million operating expenditures and $3.1 million savings in capital replacement.

MO DENIS (Las Vegas Recycling):
We have been participating with the working group for the past year on this critical issue, and we are in support of A.B. 503.

JOE HARRINGTON (Communications Director, Nevada Department of Transportation):
As was stated, we think that with this bill, there could be potential significant savings to the State. We are expending approximately $5 million a biennium to address the copper wire theft issue. We have seen that number escalate substantially in recent years. When you expand that to talk about fiber vandalism and homelessness-related issues, it is actually millions more. I am only referring to the State's right-of-way and not the right-of-way of our local governments that are close partners. For those reasons and more, we are in support of the fiscal policy of A.B. 503.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no more testimony in support, opposition or neutral, we will close the hearing on A.B. 503. I will open the hearing on A.B. 6.

ASSEMBLY BILL 6: Establishes the Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder Treatment Assistance Program within the Aging and Disability Services Division of the Department of Health and Human Services. (BDR 38-287)

RIQUE ROBB (Deputy Administrator, Aging and Disability Services Division, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services):
We are here to introduce A.B. 6 for fetal alcohol syndrome spectrum disorder.

SAMANTHA JAYME (Health Program Manager, Autism Treatment Assistance Program, Aging and Disability Services Division, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services):
Assembly Bill 6 establishes the Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder Treatment Assistance Program within the Aging and Disability Services Division of the Department of Health and Human Services. The bill amends NRS 427A to enable the Aging and Disability Services Division to provide and coordinate services for children diagnosed with Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) per the revised language in NRS 432B, ensuring interventions and resources through the age of 13.

This framework allows us to identify and train providers in evidence-based practices to build capacity. Medicaid currently covers applied behavior analysis for this population, and we will assess potential budget needs for services beyond Medicaid coverage.

During the 2023 Legislative Session, A.B. No. 422 of the 82nd Session established a pilot program for individuals with FASD administered by the Autism Treatment Assistance Program. This initiative partnered with the Families Moving Forward Program, an evidence-based intervention widely implemented across the country.

Assembly Bill 6 builds upon last session's A.B. No. 422 of the 82nd Session by formalizing the structure necessary for continued support beyond the pilot phase. This bill aligns with the Families Moving Forward Program eligibility, targeting children from 3 to 13 years of age with FASD who exhibit behavioral challenges. Early intervention during these developmental years maximizes

impact and ensures lasting improvement for children and their families. After age 14, other resources such as vocational rehabilitation become available. Currently, individuals with FASD can apply for services through the regional centers but must demonstrate substantial limitations to qualify. Assembly Bill 6 expands support for children and families while optimizing existing departmental resources.

In closing, this bill is a crucial step forward in building provider capacity and providing structured, evidence-based support for children with FASD and their families, ensuring early intervention where it matters the most.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
This is a very important bill to a very vulnerable population that needs assistance.

SENATOR TITUS:
I agree with the concept of the bill, but I wonder about where it says, "to the extent that money is available." What amount are we thinking needs to be available?

MS. ROBB:
At this point in time, we are really looking at building the structure, so we do not have a fiscal note. We're looking at the pilot from A.B. No. 422 of the 82nd Session and continuing that on, so we're not requesting funds from this body. We are looking at building the structure and collecting the data, so we can come back to this body with solid information and request a true amount. Now, we're looking at training providers so when we have the data and funding, we'll be prepared.

LEANN MCALLISTER (Executive Director, American Academy of Pediatrics, Nevada Chapter):
I am in strong support of this bill.

STEVEN COHEN:
I say ditto.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no more testimony coming forward, we will close the hearing on A.B. 6 and open the hearing on S.B. 507.

SENATE BILL 507: Revises provisions relating to the Office of Nevada Boards, Commissions and Councils Standards of the Department of Business and Industry. (BDR 18-1252)

MADISON RYAN (Remote Program Analyst):
Senate Bill 507 is a budget implementation bill related to the Office of Nevada Boards, Commissions and Councils Standards (BCCS) within the Department of Business and Industry. As background, following the passage and approval of S.B. No. 431 of the 82nd Session, the BCCS established the deputy director position and received allocations from the IFC [Interim Finance Committee] contingency account in each year of the 2023-2025 biennium to fund the position.

The BCCS indicated at the time it received the allocations that it would develop an assessment methodology during the 2023-2024 Interim based on the budget and licensing information gathered from the Boards and Commissions regarding the long-term funding plan for the BCCS and would provide a funding recommendation for consideration during the Eighty-third Legislative Session.

Senate Bill 507 would implement the Office's long-term funding plan and would authorize the BCCS by regulation to prescribe a fee to cover the costs incurred by the BCCS and adopt procedures to collect such fees from a board, commission, counsel or similar body to which services are provided.

For reference, the money committees approved funding 11 positions in total to be funded with cost allocation reimbursements over the 2025-2027 biennium. Two of these positions were approved to be funded with General Fund appropriations in FY 2025-2026 to provide the BCCS the resources to oversee all professional and occupational licensing boards in the State as required by NRS 232.8415. These positions were approved contingent upon approval of enabling legislation that would allow the BCCS to collect the fees from a board, commission, council or similar body to which services are provided. The bill also sets up the Office of Nevada Boards, Commissions and Councils Standards Account to be administered by its deputy director.

The bill removes the Commission on Postsecondary Education from NRS 232.8415 as the Commission is also created within the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) pursuant to NRS 394.383. This change would leave the Commission on Postsecondary Education with DETR

and remove the Commission from the purview of the BCCS. The bill becomes effective upon passage and approval.

SENATOR TITUS:
To confirm, is this position then funded through the fees—no General Fund monies?

MS. RYAN:
The two positions would continue to be funded with General Fund appropriations in FY 2025-2026. That's the existing deputy director position and one management analyst position that would serve as the bridge positions, so to say, while the BCCS sets up the regulation for the fee. Then the additional positions would be funded with the fees that begin in FY 2025-2026, and then in FY 2026-2027, all positions within this BCCS would be funded with the fees.

SENATOR NEAL:
So this is the Commission on Postsecondary Education that we're moving back, right?

MS. RYAN:
The Commission on Postsecondary Education is created in statute under DETR, as well as being under the purview of the Office of Nevada Boards, Commissions and Councils Standards, and DETR has continued to provide support to the Commission on Postsecondary Education this last biennium. This is the only board or commission that's an executive budget currently listed under the purview of the Office of Nevada Boards, Commissions and Councils Standards. This would just eliminate the Commission from being under the purview of the office and just leave it with DETR.

SENATOR NEAL:
I guess that's why I popped up a question on why there are even fees associated with it when it used to be there.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
It's just returning to its original home.

MS. RYAN:
Yes, that's correct.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will call those in support of S.B. 507. Seeing none for support, opposition or neutral, I will close the hearing on S.B. 507 and open the hearing on A.B. 593.

ASSEMBLY BILL 593: Makes appropriations to the Interim Finance Committee for costs associated with the implementation of the Enterprise Resource Planning System. (BDR S-1223)

TIFFANY GREENAMEYER (Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor):
Assembly Bill 593 makes an appropriation to the Interim Finance Committee to support the cost of the implementation of the Enterprise Resource Planning System project known as CORE.NV.

Section 1 of the bill appropriates State General Fund monies to the IFC in the sum of $53,434,995 to continue the support of the implementation of the Enterprise Resource Planning System.

Section 2 of the bill appropriates State Highway Fund monies to the IFC in the amount of $12,534,135 to also support the implementation of the Enterprise Resource Planning System.

SENATOR TITUS:
I'm just documenting that this is part of the Governor's budget, already in the budget.

MS. GREENAMEYER:
Yes, that's correct.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Would you please repeat that amount about appropriating?

MS. GREENAMEYER:
Section 1 of the bill appropriates State General Fund monies to the IFC in the sum of $53,434,995, and section 2 of the bill appropriates State Highway Fund monies to the IFC in the amount of $12,534,135.

SENATOR TITUS:
Again, I just want to get it on the record that this then is already in the budget. It goes to IFC in a restricted fund account to be drawn down as this program is stood up, correct?

MS. GREENAMEYER:
Yes, that is correct—CORE.NV will come to an IFC meeting to request the funds.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no one wishing to testify in support, opposition or neutral, I will close the hearing on A.B. 593 and open the hearing on A.B. 102.

ASSEMBLY BILL 102 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to emergency medical services. (BDR 40-345)

DAVE COCHRAN (President, Nevada Fire Chief Association; Fire Chief, City of Reno):
I am here to present briefly on A.B. 102 which enables a county with a population of more than 100,000 or less than 700,000, so Washoe County, to regulate emergency medical services (EMS) on the local level. That would include certifications, licensing and training for the EMS professionals in that county. It's an enabling legislation so it would be up to the county to find the money, staff, processes and procedures.

Two additional points—it does allow individuals starting at the age of 16 to engage in their internships, which is a part of the process to become an emergency medical technician (EMT). It doesn't change the requirements for EMTs; it just allows them to start the process sooner because what we are seeing is twofold. They're offering these programs at the high school level, so you have younger people entering the programs, and it's actually a great recruitment tool, selfishly, for the fire department and fire service to get people engaged sooner.

One thing the bill does not do is regulate trauma centers. That is very important to hospitals. This was never intended to do that, but we specifically called it out in the bill, so it was clear that that was not part of what the bill encompassed.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Can you give us a quick overview on the fiscal note?

MR. COCHRAN:
The State did testify—I am not testifying on their behalf—at Assembly Ways and Means, and they made it clear that the fiscal note will not impact staffing or otherwise negatively impact their service to the rest of the State.

There was an intended consequence that doing this, because the State will maintain their staffing, will empower them and enable them to provide better service to the rural communities throughout the State. Clark County has their own health district. If this were to come to pass in Washoe County, we would have our own, and that would leave the State staff available to serve the rural communities at a higher level, we believe. There was testimony to that affect in the Ways and Means Committee as well.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
The way I am reading the fiscal note on NELIS [Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System], it looks like it's very small and kind of unable to really determine how that revenue reduction might possibly be. Is that correct?

MR. COCHRAN:
That is correct. The State confirmed that in the Assembly Ways and Means Committee.

SENATOR TITUS:
I just have a quick question about eligibility at 16 years old. I was wondering, since this is a finance committee, doesn't that increase some liability on your part? Isn't there a cost there? I'm worried about that expansion down to that age. Is that standard in other jurisdictions?

MR. COCHRAN:
This would apply to Nevada, so I can't speak to other states as far as the age limit. This would not increase the cost or liability because the piece allows the 16-year-olds to do their ride along with an EMS provider, an ambulance or fire department, who carries the insurance. We do that at the Reno Fire Department, and we have insurance to cover that. There is no cost. It's part of the program through their education.

SENATOR TITUS:
I think it's a great idea because it is that pipeline of getting more paramedics, getting more firemen, getting that access and engaging someone that early in a program is a very good idea.

MR. COCHRAN:
I 100 percent agree. One of our views on that is that there's a lot of people out there who would be great and would be qualified and would enjoy the program. They just do not know how to get in, and if we can find more ways to get them in, it would be better.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
I want to make sure I understand the process in this. You are saying this is just for our county, right? Because we are the ones that fall within that piece. Then our health district, the board, would be able to vote as to whether or not they want to do this to be able to put something together so they can regulate EMTs?

MR. COCHRAN:
Yes, the board would have to establish procedures and processes and would have to vote on those. They'd have to find the funding source. It would be enabling legislation to allow them to bring that forward. They would ultimately have to be the ones to decide to move that forward.

NIC CICCONE (City of Reno):
I did just want to go on the record to say that we respectfully disagree with the State's fiscal note. As Chief Cochran had noted, this is enabling legislation. There's no guarantee that the Northern Nevada Public Health, Board of Health would take on this responsibility in the next two years. That would be entirely up to them. Additionally, if we are to take on that responsibility, it would take on that workload as well.

TODD INGALSBEE (Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada):
We wholeheartedly support this. We think allowing us to start recruiting at an early age, especially with our high school folks who are in these programs and allowing them to gain experience and understanding the job prior to committing themselves is a great idea. We also have a similar model that I worked with in Southern Nevada. The health district oversees all our EMTs, paramedics,

licensing, testing, etcetera., and it works great. We think it would be a great benefit up here as well.

JOELLE GUTMAN DODSON (Northern Nevada Public Health):
We are the local health authority for Washoe County, and we are in support of this bill. Like Nic Ciccone from the City of Reno said, this is permissive language. We would have to establish the program, find the funding and create the program. We really have to weigh whether that is feasible right now. We like that we have the language so we could have the ability to do it. We also feel like this would possibly support the State so they can support the counties that do not have a health district and will not be able to license and permit their own ambulances and EMTs. We are in support of the bill.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will close the hearing on A.B. 102 and open the hearing on A.B. 220.

ASSEMBLY BILL 220 (1st Reprint): Authorizes the issuance of identification cards by the Department of Health and Human Services to persons experiencing homelessness under certain circumstances. (BDR 38-671)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER LINDA F. HUNT (Assembly District No. 17):
This bill authorizes the Department of Health and Human Services to establish and administer a program for issuing identification cards (IDs) to residents of this State who are experiencing homelessness. Access to IDs is a fundamental necessity, yet many homeless individuals face significant barriers to obtaining IDs due to their inability to travel to the Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) offices. By allowing the department to issue IDs where many who are experiencing homelessness are already seeking assistance, we can remove a major obstacle and ensure access to essential services, employment opportunity and housing programs that require a valid ID. The language of the bill is permissive and fiscal notes from the DMV and the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services are zero.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
When they go to do this, are they going to go out to the population rather than them coming to a DMV? Is that the way that will work?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HUNT:
No, what will happen is they are going to place these kiosks in the welfare offices. When they are there, they can obtain the ID.

MR. HERNANDEZ:
The Nevada State AFL-CIO is in full support of the bill.

KAYLAH MAESE (ACLU of Nevada):
We are also in full support of this bill.

JOANNA JACOB (Clark County):
We are in support of this bill as well for many of the reasons that Assemblymember Hunt put on the record. We know that access to ID is a true barrier for those experiencing homelessness.

SARAH ADLER (Nevada Opioid Treatment Association):
We agree ID is necessary to enroll in Medicaid to then be able to receive consistent treatment. We are in support.

JONATHAN NORMAN (Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers):
We are in support.

PALOMA GUERRERO (Clark County Public Defender's Office):
We are in full support of the bill.

RYAN VORTISCH (Silver State Voices):
We are in support.

SEAN SEVER (Deputy Administrator, Research and Project Manager, Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles):
We are neutral on A.B. 220 and have a zero fiscal note on it. As mentioned, we have a program in place right now to give the unhoused IDs at no charge. If the bill passes, we would work with Health and Human Services through regulations to allow unhoused to bring IDs to the DMV and turn them into standard IDs which mirrors a similar program we have with DOC [Department of Corrections]. These will not be Nevada Real IDs and will not allow for driving privileges, but they would be good for identification purposes.

SENATOR TITUS:
There's no fiscal note. How can that be? There's a cost and you charge other people to come in and get IDs. It is not a Real ID, does it not cost as much to do a photo, and they just give you the name that they go by at that moment? Do they not need to bring anything else? I am just wondering about how this does not cost some money.

SHANNON LITZ (Deputy Director, Programs, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services):
We have done a zero fiscal note because the language is permissive. We have the opportunity for grants and gifts and things like that. We'll continue to work with the DMV and can set that up as funding is available.

SENATOR TITUS:
Under this program, then you would be able to offset any cost through the Department of Health and Human Services for these IDs.

MS. LITZ:
We will continue to work with the DMV and make sure it aligns with their process and the regulations. We know there will be setup costs, so we are really going to have to look at what that looks like. You'll see the original fiscal note did outline what some of that would look like for a setup. We would of course pursue that if and when we are able to implement.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Just to clarify, this is permissive language.

MS. LITZ:
That's correct.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I think this is a good bill. I will close the hearing on A.B. 220 and open up the hearing on A.B. 131.

ASSEMBLY BILL 131 (1st Reprint): Provides an exemption from property taxation for accessory dwelling units rented or leased to certain tenants. (BDR 32-694)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JOVAN A. JACKSON (Assembly District No. 6):
I am very honored to present A.B. 131 with my copresenters, Mendy Elliott and Bill Brewer. Assembly Bill 131 is a target measure designed to help address Nevada's affordable housing crisis by encouraging the development and utilization of accessory dwelling units (ADU). Specifically, this bill provides an exemption from the property taxation for ADUs that are rented or leased to tenants receiving assistance through the Federal Housing Choice Voucher Program, also known as Section 8.

This bill supports homeowners who open their doors to voucher recipients, helping to ensure that our most vulnerable populations and residents—including families, seniors, veterans and people on disability—have safe, stable and affordable housing. At the same time, it promotes the use of assisting residential spaces in a way that could relieve the pressure on the housing market without requiring costly new construction or major infrastructure changes.

BILL BREWER (Executive Director, Nevada Rural Housing Authority):
This is a limited approach to solving some of our housing problem. There's no silver bullet for housing. It's going to take a death by a thousand cuts to get this thing put into place, and this is just one of those cuts that we can do.

There are some ADUs out there that could be utilized for housing. We struggle as a housing authority to find units oftentimes for our tenants, so this would give them another option to be able to find units and would give the homeowner some motivation to rent to a voucher holder.

This would be a small program. It is doubtful that there would be a total of more than 50 or 60 participants at best, I would think. We have no idea until it's actually in place, but if we are fortunate and it could be 50 or 60 participants, that would be wonderful. There is a very small effect on the local government because of the property tax exemption. Again, that would be limited because of the number of units involved. Otherwise, there's virtually no cost to the program.

MENDY ELLIOTT (Flynn Giudici Government Affairs):
What is driving the fiscal note on this bill is section 6. It's a small tax exemption, and I want to make it clear that it's only for the ADU, the brick and mortars. It's not the land. The eligibility criteria are that the property has to be

leased for one year and needs to comply with local zoning laws. The housing authorities are responsible for actually looking at the piece of property, making sure that it is in compliance with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) because HUD does have some strict requirements.

We also move the effective date of this bill out to July 1, 2026, and that gave the local governments time to ramp up and work with the housing authorities to start identifying families or individuals that would qualify for the housing choice vouchers.

When we were discussing this with the local jurisdictions, we envisioned that this would really serve for veterans and seniors to rent these ADUs, and then they would be a blended family solution, and we could see them actually having dinners together. It's a pilot program, but as Mr. Brewer alluded, it truly is just one part of the solution, and it's going to take a lot of solutions right now for our issues with housing in Nevada.

We really appreciate Assemblymember Jackson bringing this bill forward, and we want to say a big thank you to the local jurisdictions as we work through the various elements toward making this actually a workable bill.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JACKSON:
Just to clarify, like Ms. Elliott said, the tax exemption is not for the land or for the primary residents; it's only for the ADU. The Housing Authorities will be keeping track of how many ADUs are a part of this program. I really do feel that this ADU program could build future revenue in the future when folks decide to take their ADU off Section 8, and then we can start receiving property taxes for those ADUs.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
Thank you for bringing this. Like you said, this is one of many solutions we should be looking at. You say it is a pilot program, so is there a particular number to start off with? I know you're delaying implementation for a year, but it is a pilot, so what does that mean?

MS. ELLIOTT:
We are trying to see if this is going to work. We looked at this program two years ago through another bill to see if it was worthwhile to implement. At the time, we were really focused on the Home Means Nevada Initiative, and we

couldn't bite off more than we could chew, so we felt that putting our emphasis on the Home Means Nevada Initiative was where we wanted to focus our attention at that time.

That program is now off, running and working, so this is the next opportunity for us to look at adding additional inventory by utilizing existing inventory. We are hoping there's a lot of interest. It's the older parts of Reno that have the ADUs, but I do want to make clear that they have to be HUD-certified, so we want to make sure that when we are providing these vouchers, the units meet the needs of those individuals. I use the term "pilot" since we've never done this before. We're hoping it works very well.

SENATOR NEAL:
What is the intersection between the pilot program that would be run here, and Assemblymember Backus's bill, A.B. 396?

ASSEMBLY BILL 396 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to housing. (BDR 22-232)

Her bill is still on the ADUs, but it seems to cross over into the HOAs. There's also a provision in here that is not just HOA specifically; it seems to also touch the broader county. How do the two supplement each other?

MS. ELLIOTT:
I am not sure that Assemblymember Backus's bill is focused on housing choice vouchers. This bill, A.B. 131, is only limited to those housing choice vouchers that the housing authorities have available. Then they would work with their landlords to identify those who would want to rent their ADU utilizing the housing choice voucher. So it's very narrowly focused only on those housing choice vouchers and then all the rules and requirements that surround those housing choice vouchers—they have to have a year lease, they have to be HUD-certified, they need to be inspected. Those individuals have to qualify for the choice voucher. We are just narrowly focused only on that segment of the population. I hope that answers your question.

SENATOR NEAL:
It does, because if the voucher was for a home in an HOA community, they wouldn't even be included in this bill, A.B. 131, because they're two separate things, but the voucher would not apply to a home that was in an HOA.

MR. BREWER:
The voucher could apply to a home in an HOA, but that situation would have to meet all the HOA rules that are in existence. It could not overrule any of the rules for the HOA.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Where are these homes going to be? Can you give me a little information on that?

MS. ELLIOTT:
I live in the old southwest part of Reno. I am looking at Senator Taylor and she is nodding; there are many ADUs in that particular area. The ADU can be a standalone, and it also could be part of the residence if they have what is sometimes called a mother-in-law quarter. So, they could be anywhere.

Since the Legislature has taken some interest in ADUs in previous legislation, we're hopeful that the utilization of the vouchers will be expanded because we think it is a quality program to blend families into the property. We're hoping it grows, and as it grows, we get additional landlords, and we serve families.

So for us, they could be anywhere in rural Nevada. There are a lot of ranches that might have an ADU that could be utilized for families out in the rural communities, so it could be anywhere.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
What are the decision points on who gets a voucher?

MR. BREWER:
Those vouchers are distributed based on a very fixed process by HUD. Recipients have to apply and be on a waiting list. They have to be chosen from the waiting list in random order based on the outline we have with HUD. Once they receive a voucher, we essentially say go forth and find a place to rent. If we have places that we know about, we try to send those voucher recipients to the landlords where we know they can rent. It's a very limited number that go out every month and try to find a place to rent.

SENATOR STONE:
Is there any maximum number of ADUs per property that one can lease out?

MR. BREWER:
Yes, there is. The maximum is one.

SENATOR TITUS:
I certainly understand the mother-in-law quarter concept and in some older parts of Reno, I know the little houses had garages. When I was in college, I lived in a number of those types of places where they had the home and then they rented out the garage or some little place that wasn't attached to the building. I'm sorry if you clarified this, but does the building have to be separate? Could it be attached to the main house?

MS. ELLIOTT:
It can be either a standalone, or it could be attached. The abatement is only on the attached mother-in-law, that 100-square-foot or that detached 1,000-square-foot standalone building, and it is only on the building, not on the land. That is part of the responsibility of the Housing Authority. They will go out and actually do the inspection and work with the assessor's office to determine what that abatement is on that square footage.

SENATOR TITUS:
Thank you for the clarification. I was wondering about that process where the Housing Authority goes out, they measure the square footage, they confirm that this is appropriate, and then they submit to the county assessor to take off X amount of square feet from the person's taxes.

MR. BREWER:
That's basically correct. It's really up to the homeowner to work with the assessor to get that tax abatement. The Housing Authority will only do the inspection to make sure the unit is habitable.

MR. CICCONE:
I am representing the City of Reno and just wanted to go on the record saying that we are in support. Initially, the bill had a negative fiscal impact to the City. Reno is only one of the five large cities that does not currently allow for ADUs, so I could not reliably tell you how much that would cost us based on the abatements. I will say we are in the middle of the process of drafting that ordinance and that would address some of the concerns related to attached versus detached and parking, etc.

MR. ROUZARD:
On behalf of Americans for Prosperity Nevada, we urge you to support A.B. 131. This bill recognizes the growing importance of ADUs as a flexible and cost-effective solution to Nevada housing challenges. By incentivizing homeowners to lease to voucher recipients, A.B. 131 promotes inclusive housing opportunities for low-income residents without resorting to heavy-handed mandates or large-scale government spending.

Crucially, this policy aligns with Nevada's broader vision of reforming outdated housing, land use and zoning regulations that limit supply, drive up costs and make it harder for Nevadans to find and afford a place to live. Instead of creating new bureaucracies, A.B. 131 leverages the private market and empowers individual homeowners to be part of the solution, offering both a financial incentive and social good.

Furthermore, the bill includes clear guidelines and safeguards, including manual verification, verification by public housing authorities and documentation requirements for county assessors. This transparency ensures that the exemption is applied fairly and only in cases where all qualifications are met. We greatly appreciate the bill sponsor, Assemblymember Jackson, for working diligently with stakeholders and ensuring that the bill was changed in a minute to work in a way that Nevadans can truly see the direct benefits. We urge this committee to vote in support of this bill.

JERRI WILLIAMS CONRAD (Reno Housing Authority):
The Reno Housing Authority is in support of A.B. 131. We want to thank the bill sponsor for all the hard work and thank this committee for hearing the bill.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no one else wishing to testify on the bill, we will close the hearing on A.B. 131 and go to A.B. 336.

ASSEMBLY BILL 336: Revises provisions relating to state purchasing. (BDR 27-458)

HOMA SAYYAR (Deputy Director, Nevada Department of Indigent Defense Services):
Assemblymember Brown-May graciously allowed me to continue to present this bill that came out of the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and

Adults with Special Needs in the last interim. It relates to the veteran preference.

There was a law passed that gave a 5 percent preference for veterans with service-connected disabilities when they are proposing on State government contracts. The following session, the Nevada State Preference was introduced which allowed any Nevada-based business to have a 5 percent preference. Those preferences do not stack, so that means our veterans with service-connected disabilities don't necessarily get any advantage over any other Nevadan, which I don't believe was the intention of the original legislation.

This bill seeks to correct that, and it also seeks to address the inverse preference which punishes Nevada businesses when they propose on government contracts out of state where it is kind of an arms race for states to count preferences against each other. A lot of states have laws that say, "If you have an inverse preference, then we have one against you."

Our GDP is such that it benefits Nevada businesses to do business elsewhere as well, so the removing that inverse preference would help them expand their businesses. There's a zero-dollar fiscal note.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
I didn't know the program existed; so that is fantastic. I just want to make sure I get it. When a veteran's organizations or companies bid on a state contract, they get the 5 percent preference. Yes, and then I know Nevada businesses get the 5 percent preference. Is a part of the bill that you want them to stack? Because I know right now, they don't stack.

MS. SAYYAR:
Currently, they do not stack. There's language in the law that says that you get one or the other. We don't even have data really on the veteran preference because it is easier than going through a process of certifying as a service-connected disabled veteran. It's easier to say, "I am a Nevadan," and you get the preference.

So, for services contracts, obviously, those are not just price. We do best value. That would give them a 5 percent boost. Now with the bill, we give them a 10 percent boost on their score. A Nevada business that is toe-to-toe with them

would only get a 5 percent boost of their score and an out-of-state business would just be scored as they normally would.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I will open it up to those in support of A.B. 336. Seeing no one wishing to testify for, against or neutral on the bill, we will close the hearing on A.B. 336 and go to A.B. 212.

ASSEMBLY BILL 212 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to early childhood education. (BDR S-815)

LESLEY PITTMAN (Waterford Institute):
Assembly Bill 212 actually renames the program of the Virtual Early Childhood Family Engagement Pilot Program and removes the word "pilot" from the program. That was a program that was passed by the Legislature in the 2013 [2023] Session via A.B. No. 348 of the 82nd Session.

Section 4 has new reporting dates and extends the program out two more years. Section 5 includes the new appropriation request of $2 million for the biennium, $1 million for each year.

In May 2024, the Waterford Institute was awarded the State contract by the Nevada State Board of Examiners to conduct the Nevada Virtual Early Childhood Pilot Project through its [Waterford] Upstart program. Waterford immediately hired a professional recruiter who began working with various community-based organizations throughout the State to find families who met the pilot projects eligibility criteria.

By June 30 and the conclusion of the first fiscal year of the program, 395 children were registered. A report that was required by A.B. No. 348 of the 82nd Session and prepared by the Nevada Division of Welfare and Supportive Services who administers the program was submitted to the Legislature at the end of the first fiscal year and includes information on the demographics of those children enrolled in the program.

Today, there are 1,170 children registered in the program; 994 children have received laptops, and 474 households have received internet service. Because we are nearly through the program which corresponds with a normal school

year, we will have program results on this cohort of participants early this summer for you.

However, submitted as an exhibit, (Exhibit E contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request from the Research Library.) for the committee's consideration is a combined cohort analysis of the learning gains achieved by 3,000 Nevada children who have participated in Upstart from 2020 to 2024 through a variety of funding mechanisms, including privately funded pilot projects targeted toward Southern Nevada Latino families, Clark County recovery funds that were granted for programs for rural families and ARP ESSER [American Rescue Plan Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief] evidence-based summer enrichment and after-school programs awarded in partnership with the Charter School Association [of Nevada].

You will find significant learning gains in this combined cohort analysis, with the majority of participating children testing at kindergarten, intermediate or advanced at the conclusion of the program. In several vocabulary areas, participating children tested at first grade levels once they concluded the program.

As you continue your work to help increase the number of Nevada children participating in early childhood education, we ask that you continue to support innovative programs like this that allow for the mixed delivery of early childhood education to meet the needs of Nevada families who, for a host of reasons, are unable or unwilling to access site-based, pre-K and/or early-learning programs for their children. I have submitted my written testimony (Exhibit F).

SENATOR NGUYEN:
You had referenced an amendment. Was it amended on the other side, or is there another amendment that you are proposing today?

MS. PITTMAN:
That was on the Assembly side, sorry.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I know that you have been doing this for two years since the last legislative session. Is that correct here in Nevada?

MS. PITTMAN:
We were awarded the contract in May 2024, so it was a late Request for Proposal (RFP) issuance by the Purchasing Division.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
How much was that RFP, and what were those funds from? Who were they distributed from?

MS. PITTMAN:
The $2 million was awarded or appropriated in 2023 by A.B. No. 348 of the 82nd Session.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
So that was a specific appropriation to Waterford Upstart in that bill, or was it to other companies that are similarly situated?

MS. PITTMAN:
No, it required an RFP process which we participated in. In full disclosure, I will share with you that we were the only ones who responded to the RFP. But it was a competitive process, and we were awarded the contract by the Board of Examiners in May 2024. We scrambled quickly, because the program starts in September, to recruit as many families as we could. We also knew that there was a September reporting deadline to the Legislature in A.B. No. 348 of the 82nd Session.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
And that $2 million that you received during that RFP process, how many students does that cover? When does that funding run out, or has it already run out?

MS. PITTMAN:
It's already been earmarked. Currently, 1,174 families are enrolled in the program. The cost of the program is $1,100 for the curriculum software and the coaches, and roughly $1,000 if a family needs internet service and a laptop. When we try and plan out what this next $2 million appropriation might accommodate in terms of families, it all really depends on how many households need internet service and/or laptops because that obviously costs a little bit more money than just the curriculum software and the coach.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I am just curious on what criteria you use to determine who is eligible for this program. I'm assuming if you are targeting children in this early childhood space, they might all need internet and devices. Is that what you're finding to be true?

MS. PITTMAN:
Yes, as I said, we had 1,174 families enrolled in the program; 994 children received laptops and 474 of those households needed internet service. The eligibility is laid out in A.B. No. 348 of the 82nd Session. To be eligible for this program, a family has to live in a rural area, has to be part of a foster family or has to meet a certain income threshold.

SENATOR NEAL:
There's a list of demographics in section 4. Are some of these low-income families in the rural communities?

MS. PITTMAN:
Yes.

SENATOR NEAL:
Does this program take advantage of the Cox Communications program for low-income families where it allows them to get a certain amount of internet at a reduced cost and sometimes for free?

MS. PITTMAN:
I don't know. I can certainly get that answer for you from my client who was unable to be part of this conversation this evening.

SENATOR NEAL:
I am just curious about that. I'm just wondering if any of the program costs are subsidized through one of the major vendors for internet offers in the State.

MS. PITTMAN:
I am happy to look into that and get back to you.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I am going to follow up on that. I was going to ask, do they apply for grants, federal funding or any other sources? Do they work through the United Way? What other sources of funding do they have?

MS. PITTMAN:
Waterford Upstart, to best of my knowledge, receives private foundation funds for programs where they go into states and conduct their own privately-funded, foundation-funded pilot programs. They use kind of a proof-of-concept when they enter into a particular jurisdiction, which is, they use private funds to do pilot projects and then utilize the results of those to demonstrate to public policymakers the value of the program and the effectiveness of their program.

That is what they've done in Nevada since 2019. They do work with Head Start in other states. I can get more information on that list of the grant programs that they work with as well.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I was getting a little distracted because I know that you are here on behalf of Waterford Upstart. So this isn't an allocation to your business; this is going through that same pilot program that is being renamed. Is that my understanding?

MS. PITTMAN:
Yes, we would have to go through an RFP process if this program is renewed because our award of that contract was just for that pilot program.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Are there other companies and other organizations, either nonprofits or other educational for-profits, that work in this space in other states and jurisdictions where your company operates?

MS. PITTMAN:
Yes. However, this bill, A.B. 212, specifically indicates that the State cannot contract with a for-profit entity for this program.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Okay, I will take support testimony. Seeing none and no testimony in opposition or neutral, I will close the hearing on A.B. 212 and open A.B. 259.

ASSEMBLY BILL 259 (1st Reprint): Establishes provisions governing prescription drugs. (BDR 40-165)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER VENICIA CONSIDINE (Assembly District No. 18):
Assembly Bill 259 is about taking an opportunity to provide relief to those Nevadans who are dealing with significant health issues. The bill is designed to reduce the cost of certain high cost, noncompetitive, life-changing drugs by extending the benefits of federally negotiated Medicare drug prices under the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (IRA) to Nevadans who are not on Medicare but need these specific life-sustaining drugs.

I brought this bill in 2023. It was A.B. No. 250 of the 82nd Session then, and there were no fiscal notes. However, it was vetoed. This session, there is one fiscal note with a monetary amount from the Public Employees' Benefits Program (PEBP). I reached out to PEBP and asked about the fiscal note. The response said that the fiscal note came from Express Scripts, which is PEBP's Pharmacy Benefits Manager (PBM). Express Scripts determined that it would be a net cost increase because they are both a PBM and also a pharmacy, so they wouldn't be getting the manufacturer's rebates. It is unclear how to respond to this when Express Scrips is both the PBM and pharmacy and is part of the vertically integrated system that A.B. 259 seeks to cut through.

The idea behind this bill is that there is a negotiated price between the manufacturer and the federal government. That is the maximum fair price of the drug, along with a pharmacy fee that could be charged to a Nevadan for the drug. So having the fiscal note state that the reason there is a fiscal note is because the PBM won't get their rebates if they utilize the maximum fair negotiated price of a very limited number of drugs for a limited number of people who are in real need of life-sustaining drugs, is problematic because the intent of A.B. 259 is that the negotiated price is the price that is intended to bypass the PBM kickback program.

This sort of shows how difficult it is to navigate the opaque nature of this system, but I brought this bill for a second time because it is about people. I believe that if a 66-year-old with blood cancer has the ability to afford life-sustaining drugs because of a negotiated price, the family of a 14-year-old fighting the same blood cancer shouldn't have to result in that child's family going through economic ruin and be forced to decide between rent, food or the life of their family member because they have to pay an astronomical price for

some of the these prescription drugs. This is a way to provide health care to Nevadans based on something that has already been federally negotiated.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
I want to just restate this because it's late, I am tired, and I want to make sure I don't miss it. So basically, the intention is to mirror the prescription discounts occurring at the national level that come through Medicare, or I think I am mixing it up with the bill that was last session.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CONSIDINE:
It's the same bill as last session. What it's meant to do is to mirror what is under the IRA that allowed Medicare to directly negotiate with the pharmaceutical manufacturers. Otherwise, you have Medicare Part D that works with PBMs and does all of that. This was separate from that for very specific high-cost, noncompetitive drugs for some of the highest needs and the highest costs, so there was no other way to find a drug because that is not out on the market. Because they created that when I was here two years ago, those drugs hadn't been selected yet. So now they are selecting those drugs and since those drugs have been selected and there's a negotiated price, the idea to try to break through this vertically-integrated system that is built on this very opaque, "what goes here, what goes there, move all the stuff," technique is to just take that and bring it to Nevada for those same drugs for that subset of people who are not on Medicare to have a more affordable way to get the drug. That's what it is based on. Does that answer your question?

SENATOR TAYLOR:
It does.

SENATOR STONE:
How does the State force these drug companies to honor the same price that they've negotiated with Medicare and the federal government that has jurisdiction over pharmaceuticals?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CONSIDINE:
The idea, when we tried to start this two years ago, was to give us time to try to work all that out before the drugs were selected, but it is something that will need to be determined, but I don't think it's impossible. I think there's a movement right now across the country to break through the current system that is there.

If this works at one level and manufacturers are willing to negotiate, I am hopefully thinking that this will not only begin a new process, but it will allow Nevada to focus on what we are supposed to focus on—the health of the people in Nevada, the safety of the people in Nevada and the ability to pay for everything that you need to pay for and not be in a situation where, because of a lack of willingness by some of the biggest companies in this country, that there are people that are not able to afford their life-saving drugs. I don't think it's impossible to work this out, but I think we need to begin a process to do it.

SENATOR STONE:
So you see this as a negotiation process, not as a hammer.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CONSIDINE:
I want to be clear that the negotiated prices between the federal government and Medicare are not what I am talking about. I am talking about the negotiation on how to make this work in Nevada is more open to fungibility.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Would you speak to the fiscal note?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CONSIDINE:
Yes. The fiscal note is the $1.8 million, and I asked how that came about. It came about because Express Scripts responded to PEBP, and their response was, "With no additional savings from manufacturer's rebates to reduce costs, they would need to increase monthly per member charges by $1.50 per member per month," which includes both the primary and dependents, so it would be for 51,168 people. This is from a letter I received from PEBP.

CELESTENA GLOVER (Executive Officer, Public Employees' Benefits Program):
So just a piece of clarification: the rebate we're talking about it is not the PBM getting the rebate. They are getting it, but they are passing it through to PEBP, and that is a revenue stream for us. Based on what they are telling us, they compared the MFP [maximum fair price] to our current ingredient costs using the 2024 costs that they had available. Their calculation is an additional $1.50 per member per month. That is, for covered life, the 51,000 that the Assemblymember was talking about. That works out for FY 2026-2027 to $921,000 and then $1.8 million in future biennia.

That is based on the ten drugs we're aware of right now. If that drug list increases, the cost potentially increases, but we don't know that for sure. We also don't know which drugs on the list the manufacturers may determine are ineligible for those rebates. Our concern is that we use that as a revenue stream to keep our premiums down for our members and the employer contributions down as well, and it is fairly significant each year.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CONSIDINE:
That is correct, and that is also the question I had about the fiscal note because this is exactly what Medicare was dealing with—this whole system of relying on rebates for all of this—which the IRA tried to break by creating this system where you have the manufacturer dealing directly with Medicare to have that, so that happens outside of the system.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I know that as a part of our budget closing, and even a lot of the programming that we are choosing to fund right now, are coming from these pharmacy rebates that you kind of alluded to. I just think I have a different understanding than what you just represented in here, so I am wondering if I could get some clarification.

I know that you have an undetermined fiscal note, but it seems like it might be potentially a very large undetermined number. I also know that we incorporate a lot of that into our state funding, not just through PEBP but other things. Is there someone who could kind of address that?

KEIKO DUNCAN (Pharmacy Director, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services):
So the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy has determined that there would be a fiscal impact and that it would potentially be quite significant, potentially in the millions, but again, indeterminable. That is dependent upon access to these particular medications at these particular prices. Dependent upon that access, it could create a shift in the compliance to our preferred drug list, which would then create a shift in the amounts of supplemental drug rebates and federal drug rebates that we would receive. That is dependent upon our utilization, and of course, those rebates also contribute to the General Fund as well.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I am sort of familiar with some of these rebate passthroughs and how they work. Part of the reason—like in other pieces of legislation—we don't see the State or PEBP or other nonprofit organizations like HealthTrust and such included in that is because there is not that same profit structure. We hope that when it comes to the State, we are good stewards of the money and we're making sure that we're reinvesting that and lowering down healthcare costs.

So when you say millions of dollars, I know that there are several programs that we've put through these money committees that were in the $50 million range, including the Majority Leader's bill, that were from some of these pharmacy rebates.

So when you say undetermined, are there any protections that we can put in place to make sure that things our budget is currently based on would not be affected by any of the pieces of legislation?

MS. DUNCAN:
That would be difficult to determine simply because of the aforementioned negotiation process that would have to take into place. We would not know how that would affect the negotiation process for our supplemental drug rebate contracts.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CONSIDINE:
This is the paradox we face in this situation because on the one hand, we want to get prescription pharmaceutical drugs to people who are truly in need. I think it is our responsibility for the State and for everyone in this State, but the current structure of the system is incredibly difficult to change because it is embedded in so many different ways that we sort of rely on this circular system to do it.

One of the reasons I brought this bill is because in talking to folks on how to try to try to resolve this issue, it was always, "Well, it's not us; it's them, there's all these issues, you're not going to be able to do this anymore because we need it for this because we depend on this." It was frustrating, because the bottom line is, I want to get to the point where we are like, "This is a person who is very sick and needs drugs and how do we get to them in a situation where they are not going to have to put their house up for sale in order to pay

for something?" This is the main paradox of our total healthcare system right now.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I think we all have that same kind of intent where we're trying to lower prescription drug costs, and I think it does take a holistic approach. I have a hard time taking off the budget hat because I know that whether rightly or wrongly, it's like in the $400 million range that we are talking about with some of these rebates. I know that we have some bills we passed out, including one from Senator Scheible around creating a single PBM for Medicaid. Obviously, your bill would impact that bill, too. I'm just trying to think out loud if there are ways to incorporate some of those things together.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Ms. Glover, could you get us the letter you referenced and send it to Mr. Thorley?

MS. GLOVER:
Yes, I can do that.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go to those in support of A.B. 259. Seeing none, I will open opposition testimony.

PRIMO CASTRO (State Government Affairs Director, Biotechnology Innovation Organization):
Biotechnology Innovation Organization is the largest trade group representing more than 1,100 biotech companies, academic institutions, state biotech centers and related organizations across the United States and 31 other nations that are involved in the research and development of health care, agricultural, industrial and environmental biotech products. We are opposed to A.B. 259, which would set caps on the price paid for prescription drugs in Nevada based on the maximum fair price as determined pursuant to the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022.

This bill's imposition of a maximum fair price would not have the effect the proponents of this bill intend and would instead risk access to medicines that many patients depend on. Many pharmacies and hospitals purchase medicines through national or original buying groups or national contracts based on

national pricing indexes and transactions that occur out of state. As a result, those transactions would not be subject to the price limits in the bill, but the price that state providers charge patients would be subject to the limits.

Out-of-pocket costs have been rising for patients because of decisions made by health insurers. In fact, insurers require patients to pay almost five times more out of pocket for prescription drugs than for hospital care. These proposed price controls disregard, and may even interfere with, the market-based ecosystem of the U.S. healthcare sector. The maximum fair price approach does not provide adequate context for the complex issue of pricing which is based not just on manufacturers cost but also on market forces and an assessment of value that cannot simply be reduced to a line on the balance sheet.

KYLE PICCOLA (Director of State Policy, Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America):
I am respectfully here in opposition to A.B. 259. We can absolutely agree that affordable access to prescription drugs is critically important for Nevadans. But we disagree that this bill will accomplish that goal. I will focus my remarks on the fiscal impact of the bill.

This bill oversimplifies an extremely complicated federal policy and fails to recognize that it will cost money to implement in the State of Nevada. As was discussed today, PEBP estimated that it could be almost $1 million during FY 2026-2027 and $1.8 million during future biennia. The Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy stated that while the fiscal impact for this bill is indeterminable, it could be significant.

I would like to point out that there are many drugs still not identified for the IRA, which means that there could be even additional fiscal implications for these programs and by 2030; up to 80 drugs can be impacted. It will also take significant resources for Nevada to pass and implement the provisions of A.B. 259. Nevada will have to create a brand-new infrastructure like they did at the federal level. A recent study from the Pacific Research Institute found specifically in Nevada that this could cost Nevada $2.3 million annually to implement. That doesn't include the technology investments that this may need.

There's also a loss for patients. According to a January 2025 report from the National Community Pharmacists Association, a majority of independent pharmacists are considering not stocking one or more of the first ten drugs

listed on the Medicare drug price negotiation program. Already, 32.8 percent of these pharmacists have decided not to stock one or more of these drugs, and another 60 percent are considering not stocking one or more of these drugs.

Lastly, the federal government has had to provide significant and additional resources since the passage of the IRA. The Biden Administration created the Premium Stabilization Demonstration Project. This pilot allocated an additional $5 billion to dampen the cost of the MFP and prevent Medicare premiums from going up. For all of these reasons, we ask that you vote no on A.B. 259 and ask that you look at proven policies that can reduce prescription drug costs for Nevadans.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no more testimony on A.B. 259, we will close the hearing and go to A.B. 479.

ASSEMBLY BILL 479 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the taxation of agricultural real property. (BDR 32-426)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HOWARD WATTS (Assembly District No. 15):
Essentially what A.B. 479 looks to do is ensure that our agricultural property owners have the ability to install solar on their land and continue to receive the property tax treatment that agricultural property enjoys. You will see within the bill, the words "agrivoltaic purposes," and that is essentially using the same piece of land both for agricultural production and solar energy development. In order to get certain property tax treatment, agricultural land has to remain in agricultural use. There was concern that if we added solar energy production onto that land, that could jeopardize the tax status. So this is meant to help encourage that and encourage the maximum use of land where possible to get the most out of it.

We made some additional adjustments to ensure this is not something that could be used on nonagricultural property to try and obtain the agricultural property tax treatment. Additionally, this can actually have the potential to increase property tax revenue because the value would have to be reassessed to account for the additional value of the solar power production. So that is what the bill does.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Would you just address the fiscal note, please?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER WATTS:
Yes, there was a fiscal note on the original bill. The amendment we made that is reflected in this first reprint addressed all of the fiscal notes and concerns, both from the State and local entities.

SENATOR TITUS:
The reason there's no fiscal note is because this property would have already been at that lower taxation rate. What this bill does is it just maintains the status quo.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER WATTS:
Yes, that is correct, Senator, and you can actually see on page 3, line 21, it explicitly requires that that land has to be receiving that tax status currently, as of July 1, essentially now, in order to receive this benefit.

SENATOR TITUS:
You have been out to rural Nevada, and you understand the water, especially in central Nevada. A lot of fields go fallow when there's lack of water. So the fields are just sitting there and not producing and there's no water for the fields, but perhaps they are getting that tax exemption, so this would allow the farmers to actually have some production on their land, and it's kind of win-win for renewable energy and also continues to maintain the agriculture discounts.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER WATTS:
Yes, that's correct. The goal is to help bolster our rural and agricultural communities by providing something that could help address their energy needs on their land and also help bring in revenue, whether it is leasing with a company or some other arrangement that brings in additional income for the landowner. Also, you may hear from folks with Eureka County that this is something they've been looking at, including in Diamond Valley, that can be incorporated with retiring some of the water-intensive alfalfa hay production, maybe moving to a lower water-use crop and also helping get some of our water-stressed basins back into balance.

I just want to note that this is not conversion. This ensures that we maintain the agricultural character of these lands in the communities.

OLIVIA TANAGER (Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter):
This is truly a win-win for revenue for our State, for agricultural communities, for renewable energy development and for water conservation. There are really a lot of bonuses here, and we've been working with a broad coalition of stakeholders on this measure, making sure that we're taking everything into account. This is a bill we proposed in the interim and we're really excited that it's gotten to this point. Again, we have been working with Department of Agriculture and a whole number of folks on this. We encourage your support on this measure.

JAINA MOAN (Nevada External Affairs Director, The Nature Conservancy):
The Nature Conservancy supports transitioning to renewable energy sources with a smart from the start approach that develops energy projects while maximizing conservation values, promoting economic development and stability in Nevada. Using already disturbed lands for renewable energy development conserves these lands for wildlife. It helps with tribal cultural values and recreational opportunities while preserving the socioeconomic structure of communities. This may also help address our declining groundwater levels, so we urge your support for A.B. 479.

VINSON GUTHREAU (Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties):
I serve as the Executive Director of the Nevada Association of Counties which represents all 17 Nevada counties. Assembly Bill 479 in its first reprint satisfied the fiscal note issue for us at the local level and we can move to support. I'm just going to take a moment to thank the proponents of this measure for reaching out to us very early on and engaging us on this and working to this solution. We urge support.

CALEB CAGE (Eureka County):
Eureka County wishes to preserve its agricultural base as much as possible, but they are also realists in recognizing the solar energy transition. Eureka County has been interested in finding ways to incentivize agrivoltaics for some time. This is in recognition of the many solar projects currently being pursued on private agricultural lands in Eureka County.

We currently have literally thousands of acres of private agricultural land under lease or some other type of site control for solar development in Eureka County. Some of these leases are on lands where irrigation water rights no longer exist. We believe integrating agriculture with solar developments is the best we can

hope for on these lands. We believe integrated use of agriculture with solar and incentivizing these is good policy.

Assembly Bill 479 as amended in the first reprint strikes the right balance in incentivizing agrivoltaics while not creating any additional revenue burdens on counties and actually enhancing tax revenue on land already assessed as agricultural property. We urge you to continue moving A.B. 479 forward.

SHEILA BRAY (Director of Government and Community Engagement, University of Nevada, Reno):
We too are in full support of this bill, and we thank Assemblymember Watts for engaging us very early on in the interim to see if we might be able to share some of the current things that we may be doing in this space.

Just as many of the other proponents have shared, and I really thank Senator Titus for her question as well, I believe that is exactly what we're trying to also achieve within specifically the College of Agriculture and the Extension. We think this is a unique opportunity for us to continue exploring the possibilities for our agriculture future.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no one wishing to testify on this bill in opposition or neutral, we'll close the hearing on A.B. 479 and transfer into a work session. We will start with Senate Bill 185.

SENATE BILL 185 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to Medicaid coverage for care of disabled or chronically ill children. (BDR 38-760)

JOHN KUCERA (Principal Program Fiscal Analyst):
Senate Bill 185 was heard in this committee on May 16. The first revision requires Medicaid to cover personal care services provided to a Medicaid participant who is less than 18 years of age and has been diagnosed with a disability or chronic illness which prevents that participant from performing activities of daily living.

Sections 1 and 2 become effective on passage and approval for the purpose of adopting regulations and other purposes on January 1, 2026. The fiscal impact provided by the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy on the bill as introduced included an approximate $1.2 million General Fund impact.

The bill, as revised on reprint 1, included a significantly larger impact totaling approximately $24 million in General Fund appropriations. However, during the testimony on May 16 the sponsor of the bill, Senator Angela Taylor, talked about a conceptual amendment which would adjust the fiscal impact which will be discussed here shortly.

There were several parties in support of the bill, none in opposition and none in neutral. The proposed amendment that was discussed on the May 16 hearing would lower the fiscal impact, and it would revert eligibility and service limitations to the original version of the bill. Additionally, the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy on May 28, yesterday, proposed adjusting the implementation date to January 1, 2027, from January 1, 2026.

In total and considering both of these amendments—the conceptual amendment that was posted on NELIS and the conceptual amendment provided by the agency adjusting the implementation date—the total fiscal impact in General Fund appropriations would be $135,086 in FY 2025-2026 and $414,251 in FY 2026-2027, including approximately $922,000 in authorized federal funding.

If the committee wishes to take action to include total General Fund appropriations of $549,337 over the biennium, adjust the implementation date to January 1, 2027, and to adopt the proposed conceptual amendment to adjust eligibility and service limitation provisions to align with the original version of the bill, the appropriate motion would be to amend and do pass as amended.

> SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 185.
>
> SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

WAYNE THORLEY (Senate Fiscal Analyst):
The next bill for consideration is Senate Bill 207 which the committee previously took action on a few days ago.

SENATE BILL 207 (1st Reprint): Requires the establishment of a program of all-inclusive care for the elderly. (BDR 38-763)

MR. THORLEY:
After having further discussions with the bill sponsor and the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, the committee may wish to rescind its previous action on this bill in order to consider a different action, which will be explained here shortly. So if the committee wishes to rescind their prior action, a motion will need to be made to rescind the prior action on S.B. 207.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO RESCIND THE PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN ON S.B. 207.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. KUCERA:
The first revision of S.B. 207, as Mr. Thorley noted, was heard previously in this committee on May 26 and 27. As amended, this bill transfers authority to establish and administer a program of all-inclusive care for the elderly, commonly known as PACE [Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly], from the Aging and Disability Services Division. This bill is effective upon passage, approval and for all other purposes on January 1, 2026.

On the bill as introduced, the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services of the Department of Health and Human Services included a fiscal impact for various vendor supports to implement this program. In conversations with the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services earlier today, Administrator Thompson confirmed that—based on clarification regarding the anticipated scale of the program—Welfare would have no fiscal impact regardless of the implementation date of the bill.

The Division of Health Care Financing and Policy on initial versions of the bill included net costs of approximately $1.2 million in total over the biennium, including about $627,000 in General Fund appropriations. Net ongoing costs would also be included.

The update based on the first revision of the bill included an updated fiscal impact of total General Fund appropriations of $293,055 in FY 2025-2026 and $184,057 in FY 2026-2027. This bill would also include $415,808 in authorized federal funds to implement the provision of the bill.

Testimony was provided by Senator Taylor along with testimony by the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy; support was provided by the Primary Care Association, an Advantage Plan provider, as well as an individual. There was no opposition or neutral testimony.

If the committee wishes to incorporate General Fund appropriations totaling $477,112 over the biennium, including associated authorized funding to carry out the provisions of the bill, the appropriate motion would be to amend and do pass as amended.

> SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 207.
>
> SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
The next bill on work session is A.B. 6.

CATHY CROCKET (Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst):
Assembly Bill 6 was heard in committee this morning. It creates the Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder Treatment Assistance Program within the Aging and Disability Services Division of the Department of Health and Human Services. The bill was presented by representatives of the division. Regarding fiscal impact, it was noted that the bill is permissive, and the program is to be established to the extent that money is available, so no funding is required to implement the bill.

There was one comment in support, no comments in opposition or neutral and no amendments were presented or discussed. If the committee wishes to approve the bill, the appropriate motion would be to do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 6.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go on to Assembly Bill 376.

MR. THORLEY:
Assembly Bill 376 was heard this morning in this committee. It revises provisions relating to insurance and was presented by Assemblymember PK O'Neill and Adam Plain with the Division of Insurance. The bill requires the Commissioner of Insurance to establish and administer the Regulatory Experimentation Program for Insurance Product Innovation and sets forth requirements and operations for the program and does other things.

There was testimony in support from the American Association of Property Casualty Insurers, Nevada Insurance Council, Nevada Policy Research Institute and the Americans for Prosperity of Nevada. There was opposition testimony from four individuals, although many of them said with the conceptual amendment, which was received late in the committee hearing, that they would change their testimony to support. Neutral testimony was from CAI [Community Associations Institute] and the Nevada Justice Association.

There was an amendment presented at the end of the bill hearing that you all should have received. I will not go over that in detail unless there are any questions. The Division of Insurance testified at the bill hearing this morning that, with the amendment that has already been adopted on the bill that has removed the fiscal impact, the conceptual amendment that was presented at the bill hearing this morning had no change on that. So, there's no fiscal impact to the bill.

If the committee wishes to move this bill with the conceptual amendment, Exhibit D, presented this morning, the appropriate action would be to amend and do pass as amended.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 376.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go to A.B. 503.

MS. CROCKET:
Assembly Bill 503 was heard this morning. It establishes penalties for willfully removing, damaging or destroying certain critical electrical infrastructure to obtain used utility wire.

The bill was presented by Assemblymember Selena Torres-Fossett. Regarding the fiscal impact, it was noted that a fiscal impact of the Department of Corrections was removed with a prior amendment. There were no additional fiscal impacts noted for the State. There were three comments in support, no comments in opposition or neutral and no amendments were presented. If the committee wishes to approve the bill, the motion would be to do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 503.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go on to A.B. 570, Mr. Thorley.

MR. THORLEY:
Assembly Bill 570 was heard this morning in committee. It makes appropriations to the Department of Corrections for various purposes relating to certain technology, training and equipment. The bill was presented by

Director Dzurenda with the Department of Corrections. There is no testimony in support, opposition or neutral. The various dollar amount of the appropriations and their purposes are listed in the various sections of the bill.

There were no amendments presented. However, Fiscal staff has a recommended amendment related to the language in section 5 of the bill. This bill was amended in the Assembly to reduce the dollar amount in section 5 essentially to eliminate funding in section 5 for a garbage truck, a dump truck and two of the refrigerated trucks. However, language in section 5 still exists related to a garbage truck and a dump truck.

If the committee wishes to move this bill, Fiscal staff recommends an amendment in section 5 to remove the reference to a garbage truck and a dump truck so that just a reference to a refrigerator truck would remain. If the committee wishes to move this bill with that amendment, the appropriate action would be to amend and do pass as amended.

> SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 570.
>
> SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Alrighty, let's go to A.B. 572.

MS. CROCKETT:
Assembly Bill 572 was heard in committee this morning. It makes General Fund appropriations totaling approximately $333,000 over the biennium to the DOC for equipment purchases and furniture replacement at various conservation camps throughout the State. The bill was presented by the director of the DOC. There were no comments in support, opposition or neutral and no amendments were presented. If the committee wishes to approve the bill, the appropriate motion would be to do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 572.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I will go to Mr. Thorley for A.B. 574.

MR. THORLEY:
Assembly Bill 574 was heard this morning in committee. It makes an appropriation to the DOC for the purchase and replacement of equipment and furniture at the High Desert State Prison. The various appropriation amounts and the purposes of those appropriations are listed in the various sections of the bill, which I will not go over unless there are any questions.

The bill was presented by Director Dzurenda with the Department of Corrections. There was no testimony in support, opposition or neutral, no amendments presented or discussed. If the committee wishes to move this bill, the appropriate action would be due pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 574.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go to Ms. Crocket for A.B. 576.

MS. CROCKET:
Assembly Bill 576 was heard this morning. It appropriates $18.9 million of Highway Fund to the Department of Public Safety, Nevada Highway Patrol Division (NHP) for various equipment purchases and replacement of motorcycles and vehicles. The bill was presented by representatives of the NHP. There was

no testimony in support, opposition or neutral, and no amendments were discussed. If the committee wishes to move the bill, the appropriate motion would be to do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 576.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
All right; we will go to Ms. Crocket again for A.B. 593.

MS. CROCKET:
Assembly Bill 593 was heard this morning. It appropriates General Fund monies of $53.4 million and Highway Fund monies of $12.5 million to the Interim Finance Committee contingency account for allocation to the Governor's Office of Finance for costs associated with implementing the Enterprise Resource Planning System project known as CORE.NV. The bill was presented by the Governor's Finance Office.

There were no comments in support, opposition or neutral and no amendments were presented. If the committee wishes to approve the bill, the appropriate motion would be to do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 593.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We have one more bill on work session, S.B. 507. I will go back to Mr. Thorley.

MR. THORLEY:
Senate Bill 507 was heard this morning in committee and presented by Fiscal staff. The bill revises provisions relating to the Office of Nevada Boards, Commissions and Councils Standards of the Department of Business and Industry. This is a budget implementation bill. It implements the closing budget actions of the money committees. When closing the budgets for the Department of Business and Industry, in particular, this bill would authorize the Office of Nevada Boards, Commissions and Councils Standards to assess a fee to the various occupational licensing boards in order to fund the operations of the office.

The bill also would move the Commission on Postsecondary Education back to the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. There's no testimony in support, opposition or neutral. There are no amendments. If the committee wishes to move this bill, the appropriate action would be to do pass. Thank you very much, and I will accept a motion to do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 507.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

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

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Hearing no public comment, this meeting is adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Linda Hiller,
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
A.B. 282	C	5	Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop	Conceptual Amendment: Assemblymember David Orentlicher
A.B. 376	D	24	Assemblymember PK O'Neill	Proposed Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 212	E	48	Leslie Pittman / Waterford Institute	Nevada Upstart Cohorts (2020-2024)-Summary of Overall Outcomes
A.B. 212	F	48	Leslie Pittman / Waterford Institute	Written Testimony