MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Eighty-third Session
May 30, 2025

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Marilyn Dondero Loop at 9:05 p.m. on Friday, May 30, 2025, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 6 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit A is the agenda. Exhibit B is the attendance roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau. Link to Executive Budget. Link to Budget Amendments.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May, Assembly District No. 42
Assemblymember Rebecca Edgeworth, Assembly District No. 35
Assemblymember Gregory T. Hafen, Assembly District No. 36
Assemblymember Brian Hibbetts, Assembly District No. 13
Assemblymember Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District No. 41
Assemblymember Gregory S. Koenig, Assembly District No. 38
Assemblymember Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15
Assemblymember Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Wayne Thorley, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Cathy Crocket, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Marie Bell, Committee Staff Manager

Bepsy Strasburg, Committee Secretary
Dee Chekowitz-Dykes, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Division of Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles
Clarissa Cota, Vice President, External Relations, College of Southern Nevada
Patricia Charlton, Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education
Thomas Morley, Laborers Local 872; Teamsters Local 631
Nick Schneider, Vegas Chamber
Lawrence Weekly, Vice President, External Relations and Campus Operations, College of Southern Nevada
Aaron Ibarra, Chief of Staff, Southern Nevada Building Trades Union
Jonathan Norman, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Nic Ciccone, City of Reno
Joanna Jacob, Clark County
Harrison Bohn, HopeLink of Southern Nevada
Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County
Katie Coleman, Communications Director, Nevada Rural Housing
Mendy Elliott, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority
Maurice Page, Executive Director, Nevada Housing Coalition
Jessica Goodey, Las Vegas Township Justice Court, Department 6, Clark County
Kendra Bertschy, Reno Township Justice Court, Department 2, Washoe County
Kristen Defer, Deputy Director, Nevada Department of Public Safety
Shellie Hughes, Executive Director, Nevada Department of Taxation
Becky Dutro, Nevada Taxpayers Association
Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League
Grace Michaelson, Western Resource Advocates
Shane Piccinini
Leann McAllister, Executive Director, Nevada Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics
Sheila Bray, University of Nevada, Reno
Amy Hyne-Sutherland, Nevada Association of Counties
Leo Benavides, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Logan Cayton, Southern Nevada Health District
Sabrina Schnur, Nevada Public Health Association; Nevada Primary Care Association

Cari Herington, Executive Director, Nevada Cancer Coalition
Peter Saba, Nevada Restaurant Association
Jesse Wadhams, Ferino Distillery
Trevor Parrish, Vegas Chamber
Alejandro Rodriguez, Nevada System of Higher Education
Michael Flores, University of Nevada, Reno
Austin Lipson
Drew Cross, State Forensic Program Coordinator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I will open today's meeting and call Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May to the table to introduce Assembly Bill (A.B.) 117.

ASSEMBLY BILL 117 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to special license plates. (BDR 43-48)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER TRACY BROWN-MAY (Assembly District No. 42):
Assembly Bill 117 is the Las Vegas Aces license plate bill. You know how much we love license plates in the Nevada Legislature. The Las Vegas Lady Aces are two-time WNBA champions. They are the only major sports team in Nevada that does not currently have their own license plate. The funds that are accrued from this license plate sale will benefit the Las Vegas Aces Foundation. Those funds will support youth sports, female sports and other local activities in Southern Nevada as determined by the mission statement of the Las Vegas Aces Foundation.

We had a policy hearing and a fiscal hearing on the Assembly side. We determined that there is no real fiscal impact relative to this piece of legislation. We were very excited to have hosted the owner of the Las Vegas Aces and a lot of their senior management team, including Bucket$, their mascot, during the presentation of this bill on the Assembly side.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
When you showed the picture of the license plate there were some different letters next to that. Are there options, or is the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) trying to decide, or what is that?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
In researching and how we develop license plates, each plate issued has a double letter stack. The double letter stack comes through the approval of the DMV. Right now, we don't know exactly what the Las Vegas Aces plate is going to look like. There were a number of ideas being drafted that would then have to go through the approval process with the DMV to make sure that the double letter stack is available and that they could issue it.

There is another plate that has two Xs—that would be the love plate, and those stand for kisses because that was available—so I know the Aces are working to be creative in their plate development.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Thank you very much for that explanation. I understand you said the fiscal note has been removed. Seeing no one wishing to testify in support or opposition to A.B. 117, I will take neutral testimony.

SEAN SEVER (Deputy Administrator, Division of Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles):
We are neutral on A.B. 117, but we did have a fiscal note. It was a "cannot be determined at the time, zero impact." However, that was at the start of the session when there were nine or ten license plates proposed. Now we're down to three, so we're good with a zero.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Thank you, seeing no more neutral testimony coming forward, we will close the hearing on A.B. 117 and open the hearing on A.B. 221.

ASSEMBLY BILL 221: Exempts certain offices of physicians and other health care facilities from certain permitting requirements relating to anesthesia and sedation. (BDR 40-672)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER REBECCA EDGEWORTH (Assembly District No. 35):
To be respectful of your time, I am just going to briefly describe the problem, the solution and most importantly, why there's no fiscal note. I have strongly encouraged a lot of extremely excited dentists to not call in with testimony, but there was a lot of testimony in the Assembly Committee on Health and Human Services and no opposition.

This bill addresses a very specific subset of dentists—dentists who are both medical doctors (MDs) with doctorates in medical dentistry (DMDs). All dentists are already being inspected and regulated by the Dental Board [Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada] for all dental procedures. But in 2008, there was a little outbreak of Hepatitis C. You probably saw it in the news from the Endoscopy Center in Las Vegas. Then, the Medical Board [Board of Medical Examiners] and the Legislature required extra inspections and regulation for MDs, which was appropriate at the time, but it was never meant to affect dentists who are already being inspected and regulated by the Dental Board.

Currently in Nevada, there are only seven people who have chosen to have their MD and their DMD. That's seven people in the whole state. For those people who have to have dental inspections as well as medical inspections, it takes time out of their day doing paperwork, it costs a lot of extra money for inspections, and it takes up time when they could otherwise be seeing patients because they have to shut down their clinic to do the inspection.

There are also a lot of people in this State—we estimate dozens—that have an MD/DMD but are choosing not to designate themselves as an MD because of this onerous and burdensome extra inspection. There are also a lot of MD/DMD individuals who have chosen not to practice in Nevada because we're one of only two states that dings people twice. We're trying to alleviate this burden by exempting an office of a physician if they're only doing dental procedures and if they're already being inspected by the Dental Board, as they surely are.

Originally, there was a tiny fiscal note which was not a cost; it was just for the six facilities that pay $1,200 or something like that for each inspection. That came to less than $9,000 as a decrease in revenue. But the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) decided they could absorb that because it would be less paperwork and less sending people out to do the inspections.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I am amazed there are only seven in Nevada that hold both degrees.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER EDGEWORTH:
There are dozens. There are at least 20 in Northern Nevada, but there are only 7 who have chosen to use the MD/DMD designation. If we could get this passed, there would be an awful lot more people who would choose to use both of their licenses.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Can you describe what types of procedures the doctor-dentists that are practicing engage in?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER EDGEWORTH:
Theoretically, the same exact procedures that a DDS or DMD is doing. However, these individuals have chosen to get additional training for invasive procedures, but they are double trained for mostly the same procedures.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go to those in support of A.B. 221. Seeing no one coming forward in opposition or neutral testimony, I will close the hearing on A.B. 221 and open the hearing on A.B. 379.

ASSEMBLY BILL 379: Makes an appropriation to the College of Southern Nevada for the development of its Northwest Campus. (BDR S-1067)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BRIAN HIBBETTS (Assembly District No. 13):
Assembly Bill 379 is an appropriation act for the College of Southern Nevada (CSN) development of its Northwest Campus which includes the two parcels at Elkhorn and Durango. If you are familiar with the northwest side of Las Vegas, you have seen these two dirt lots for the past 20 years with a big sign saying, "future home of ... ." The purpose of what we're trying to do at that site is build CSN's public safety campus.

They currently have their police academy in Henderson on Water Street, and they are spending $500,000 a year in rent for a space they can no longer occupy because it is too small. The ultimate vision of this place is to move all of their law enforcement, fire sciences and EMS training to this campus once it is fully built out. That will take several years, and there will also be general education classrooms there so that people in the northwest area do not have to travel to either the Cheyenne or Charleston campus in order to complete their general education classes.

This is in my district, barely, but it is thanks to redistricting. I am a big proponent of this because of my law enforcement background. I've seen the training that comes out, and I think giving them a bigger, better spot only enhances their training opportunities.

CLARISSA COTA (Vice President, External Relations, College of Southern Nevada): On behalf of CSN and our president, Dr. William Kibler, we really want to thank this body for your support last session in granting us $4.5 million in planning dollars to develop the Northwest Campus project, which is before you today. The CSN went all in, along with many stakeholders, and invested an additional $4.5 million for an investment total of $9 million to develop this shovel-ready project. Since then, we have spoken to so many public agencies, community partners and stakeholders far and wide who are all very supportive of this higher education access point in this part of our valley.

As Assemblymember Hibbetts mentioned, the Northwest Campus, if you're familiar with Las Vegas, is located on Durango Drive and Grand Montecito Parkway. This project is really a game-changer for the constituents and their families in Southern Nevada. It's been part of an overall master plan for well over 20 years. I live in the area, so I've always been keeping a close eye on it.

The plans are designed and ready to build this first building on this 40-acre parcel of land to house our police academy. It would allow us to get out of a leased space and allow us to really meet the needs for highly trained law enforcement professionals because we are at capacity currently where we are. It also would include an emergency vehicle operating course.

We've identified that there are close to 10,000 CSN students who already reside in this northwest quadrant of the Las Vegas Valley. For that reason, it's very important that we also offer general education courses. It would be an expansion of our CSN High School to allow for dual enrollment opportunities, student support services, and it really would be a higher education hub for all students and their families. We would be ready to serve 1,900 students in the first year.

Knowing the fiscal realities of this session and the fact that this land is undeveloped, we know that the price tag is very high at $155 million, but you all have a very difficult job to do. All indications are that the full funding is not available this session. However, we continue to appreciate the support that we have for this master plan.

We therefore are respectfully asking that this bill be amended to replace the $1 placeholder amount to $500,000 to allow us to keep our planning documents current, be ready for the next legislative session and keep this

education and workforce-centered project shovel-ready if approved. The College of Southern Nevada is prepared to match up to the amount requested. This land was originally conveyed by the Bureau of Land Management and will revert back in 2028, therefore aligning the timing for consideration in the next legislative session. We continue to thank you for your support.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Thank you very much. So, we went from $1 to $500,000 in the last about 45 minutes because I just talked to Assemblymember Hibbetts earlier. So, will you be able to do it for the dollar?

MS. COTA:
Currently, we would not have the funds. We've been working with the State Public Works Division and knowing the realities of this legislative session; we've been discussing the potential amount it would cost to keep these planning documents current and ready for the next session.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
I guess I am at a loss because we received a bill that was amended to be a dollar. Somebody needs to explain to me the wisdom of why we have a bill that is a dollar—that has now come over to the Senate side and was not amended on the Assembly side—to now say that this bill, as written with a dollar, is impossible and cannot accomplish any of the things that you are seeking to accomplish with it.

So, unless we amend it to include additional monies, this bill should not pass and die? I guess I don't understand how it is that we received a bill that appropriates $1 that is nonfunctional and that unless we add additional monies, we just shouldn't pass.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HIBBETTS:
This bill was put in for a dollar as a placeholder because the original ask was $150 million, and I said, "absolutely not." I knew the economic realities of our State and said I would put it in as a dollar as a placeholder so that when we get to the end of session, have closed budgets, and we see what type of money is available, then we can make a determination whether there is money available for this project or not.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
So why was this bill not amended on the Assembly side where we are appropriating monies? It came out of a money committee. It is now in a money committee in the second House. How come this bill was not appropriated money on the other side? When we have bills that are moving from one House to the other with money attached to them in order to move out of the money committees—if this was put in with a dollar and not amended—can you explain to me how come it was not amended on the other side to come over to us, and now we are going to put some sort of an amendment onto this bill?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HIBBETTS:
Unfortunately, I was not involved in that decision. It was work-sessioned and moved.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
What was the conversation? I can certainly go back and look at all of the hearings in the time that we have left here in this Legislative Building. What was the conversation on the Assembly side during the hearing? Was it, "We are good with a dollar," or "This was put in as a placeholder, can you appropriate some money to it?" Somehow, it got moved without any money attached to it.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HIBBETTS:
It's the latter. It was in the hearing that this is a placeholder.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
Madam Chair, this may be more of a comment than a question. This is the first time that I have seen a bill come into a money committee that was intentionally put in with just a placeholder amount that was nonfunctional, passed over to the second House without money attached to it, and now we are going to go ahead and find the money to try and fund it. I don't know, I am at a little bit of a loss with this committee as to how that is the case because this is the first time that I have ever seen this happen. I have a couple more questions if you will, Madam Chair.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Yes, and I agree with you, Majority Leader, because if we all put in our bills with a dollar placeholder, we would be in really big trouble.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
I think that maybe you actually said it better than I did. That sort of subverts the purpose of bills with appropriations going to money committees if we're just passing everything with a functional dollar amount in order to ensure they move along and then trying to figure out the money on the back end while other bills are moving back and forth between the Houses that actually have money attached to them.

I've heard a couple of different numbers, but $155 million, as I understand it, is the cost of the entire project, correct?

MS. COTA:
Correct. In our initial presentations, we've always been representing that the total cost of the project is $155 million.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
And today you are asking for this committee to amend this bill for it to be $500,000?

MS. COTA:
Yes, it is an amendment. When we entered the session, the dollar amount was a placeholder as we were moving through and also representing in all of our presentations that the total cost was $155 million. There were other milestones within the legislative session that were giving us more insight as to what the fiscal reality was going to be for the State. We also listened to the guidance of many of the Legislators we spoke with and realized that along the way we were going to need to pivot. As I said in my comments earlier, we also realized that knowing the fiscal realities and the difficult situation we are in, we weren't going to be able to be replacing the dollar amount with the full amount. That is why we are before you today.

We are also working in cooperation with Public Works to give us an estimate of what it would be in order to keep these planning documents current and ready for the next legislative session.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
I think my frustration is the idea of there being milestones along the way that then informed a decision, and we still have a bill sitting in front of us for a

dollar. That does not make sense to me. Nevertheless, this $500,000 would be for planning dollars. Is that correct?

MS. COTA:
Correct. In conversations with Public Works, our understanding is that there is a cost to continue to keep the current planning documents and be updating them within the interim and be able to come within two years from now before this body to be presenting the shovel-ready project. So, there is a cost associated with keeping those planning documents current.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
I understand. We have many, many projects that have planning dollars attached to them, some of which have been going on for as many sessions as I have been in this Legislative Building, so I'm familiar with the idea of the planning documents and how it is that we make sure those are current.

In terms of fiscal realities, as I understand it in the budget, and this is not how it was reflected in the budget, but I'm sure I've got this correct. In the budget, there were not additional projects left for the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Capital Improvement Program (CIP). I know there's folks from NSHE here, so I hate that I might volunteer them to make some comments along the way—but there were not CIP dollars in the Governor's recommended budget that were approved out of this Legislative Building.

There were some maintenance dollars associated with NSHE institutions but not CIP in terms of the fact that we know there are many institutions that have a number of needs for buildings that are either old and crumbling or things that need updating or other pieces of either planning dollars or other items.

This may be the question that I am going to pose to NSHE. Where on the list of priorities does this fall? If we're going to talk about the budget realities and the implications thereof for a bill, we have to do that in the context of what the other priorities are within the similar types of projects. If we were going to appropriate money for planning dollars or for construction purposes for CIP purposes within NSHE, there are a lot of other projects that we've heard about which would also need to be funded. These are buildings that are crumbling, not functional or have been in the process of planning for a long time. So where does this sort of thing fall?

PATRICIA CHARLTON (Chancellor, Nevada System of Higher Education):
This is actually new information for me today, so I will say that yes, this project is on the NSHE capital priorities. However, in light of the current fiscal reality that we face and the fact that NSHE has some very key top priorities that are still remaining with Assembly Ways and Means—particularly ongoing existing personnel cost—our priority, should eligible capital be available, would be some items in buildings that need to be sustained and also life safety issues. Those are at the top of our priority list as well and recognizing that planning dollars do also set up some processes for the next session. I hope that answers your question.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
It does. I think that addresses the two things I had questions around. When it comes to how the money committees are funding things when we do not have oodles of money sitting around to just appropriate to all sorts of projects, there has to be some level of consideration with respect to priorities. Sometimes, that means things that are lower on priority lists do not get funded because we just don't have those monies.

As I understand your answer, there are other priorities that have to get funded first—things like money to sustain the folks who are working in these institutions—and it sounds like it is a top priority because without those, you just don't have those programs, and you don't have the ability to even have students on campus to be able to continue to sustain this.

Additionally, when it comes to CIP projects, there are always priorities of what makes sense and what doesn't. We see that in the Senate Committee on Finance's Subcommittee on K-12/Higher Education/CIP as we are reviewing CIP projects. That subcommittee also sees those CIP projects to make those determinations. So, if we're talking about finding some money to do some CIP things, where does this fall on the list?

And if this is coming over from another House and is somehow not in a priority list of things that another House is trying to fund, then I guess I am just going back to the original point. I am curious what we are doing with a bill that has a dollar but is being asked to be amended without some consideration of those budgetary pieces aside from the fact that we don't have $155 million to put into one project. I will leave it at that.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I can't even describe the level of frustration that I have with this presentation. I mean, I literally talked to you less than 35 minutes ago when we were joking about a $1 appropriation. I assumed you would come in here and discuss that this had been fully vetted in the Assembly. It passed out of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee two days ago. It's not like the financial situation has improved, so to come in here and say, "We weren't sure what the financial situation was going to be; we're looking to see if there were dollars involved," is frustrating.

Two days ago, the Assembly Ways and Means Committee knew what the financial situation was, and it is not like money has miraculously appeared in those two days. So, for that to come over here in a two-day time period—and now there is an amended fiscal note—is really, really disappointing on so many levels. It is just shocking. There are no other words I have for this that we're seeing here.

I thought maybe you were going to come in and say, "It's a dollar because we have a donor, and we need to do some sort of symbolic transfer of money to be able to get some land to do stuff." So it's just crazy that we're sitting here in this situation today. I am just going to express my incredible frustration with this bill, this bill presentation and the way that this has moved over from the other House into this House and put us in a very insane situation. We are being asked for $500,000 in a hearing without any kind of warning and with no change of circumstances between May 28, when this passed out of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee to as it is being presented here today.

I don't really have any words to say about this other than I am just incredibly frustrated with the lack of communication on this bill and the lack of communication apparently within NSHE to know that this bill was moving forward, and it isn't even a priority within NSHE. I mean, there are so many other things that we are dealing with here today.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I guess I would just follow that up by saying the Senator is correct. Forty minutes ago, we were upstairs laughing about how we were going to pay out this dollar, whether it was going to be quarters or pennies. And it wasn't like we were laughing with other people; we were laughing with the bill sponsor. I am just going to make a broad statement here, and if you are

listening, listen to the broad statement—there's only one thing you have in this building, and that's your word.

So, I am just incredibly disappointed. If I hadn't had this conversation and this happened, I might feel differently, but I'm like the rest of us up here in total shock. Maybe next session, we just put a dollar placeholder on everything and then we figure out that we need billions of dollars at the end. So, I don't even know what to say at this point.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HIBBETTS:
First of all, let me apologize because I made the incorrect assumption that there were discussions between our house and your house. When I was speaking with you earlier, I actually assumed that you knew what my plan was, and I shouldn't have. That was my fault. Allow me to apologize for that.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Thank you very much. I will ask those in support of A.B. 379 to come forward.

THOMAS MORLEY (Laborers Local 872; Teamsters Local 631):
Last week, I helped facilitate a meeting between the Southern Nevada Building Trades Union, as well as CSN, and they did sign a memorandum of understanding (MOU), and we are in support of the project.

NICK SCHNEIDER (Vegas Chamber):
We are also here in support of the project and the expansion of education in the northwest with the amendment. We will have to review if dollars will allow it.

LAWRENCE WEEKLY (Vice President, External Relations and Campus Operations, College of Southern Nevada):
I am here in support of this project as well as the amendments.

AARON IBARRA (Chief of Staff, Southern Nevada Building Trades Union):
We strongly support this investment in the College of Southern Nevada's Northwest Campus because it strengthens the partnership that is already delivering real outcomes for Nevada students, workers and families. Through our current MOU with CSN, over 3,000 apprentices across our 19 affiliated trades are earning college credit as they complete the registered apprenticeship programs. These are high-quality, tuition-free and debt-free career pathways where students earn while they learn, receiving wages, benefits and hands-on

training from day one. We are finalizing an expanded agreement with CSN that will provide all our apprentices with additional resources, offering orientation, access to academic and support services, and the opportunity to graduate with both a journeyman trade certification and an academic degree.

This new campus would potentially serve almost a third of our registered apprentices. This planning appropriation ensures that CSN can continue advancing its vision for accessible career-connected education while keeping this project aligned with future workforce and infrastructure needs. When construction is eventually funded, we're also working to ensure that union-trained local workers and the very same CSN students that this will serve will be the ones that build it under a project labor agreement. This is the model we believe in, one that builds careers, strengthens families and keeps public investment through our communities. We urge your support of A.B. 379.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Thank you very much. Seeing no testimony in opposition or neutral, we will close the hearing on A.B. 379 and open the bill hearing for A.B. 475.

ASSEMBLY BILL 475 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to Clark County, the City of Reno and the Nevada Rural Housing Authority for eviction diversion programs. (BDR S-1094)

JONATHAN NORMAN (Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers):
Assembly Bill 475 is an appropriation of $21 million for eviction diversion efforts in the three partners—Clark County, the City of Reno and the Rural Housing Authority—that have been doing rental assistance in our State for a number of years successfully. Eviction diversion court has been extremely successful in the Reno Justice Court and the Las Vegas Justice Court, but that doesn't exist in every justice court in the State, so there is the ability within this bill to do ordinary rental assistance.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
Would this just be funding for the ongoing eviction court program?

MR. NORMAN:
It is ongoing. We have eviction diversion programs in Las Vegas Justice Court and Reno Justice Court. For those parts of our State that don't have a diversion court, it would just be more traditional rental assistance. Diversion court is the

future and where we should be headed as a state, but not every justice court is able to implement that. The reason is that it wraps people in services, so it is able to assess if a senior is behind on their rent and their income is social security—we don't want to just kick the can and say we're going to cover two months of rent, meaning there is going to be an eviction in two months.

The power of diversion court is the county, legal aid agencies and other providers are able to try to find more sustainable housing when you are not exactly in that crisis moment and then potentially rehouse that person. Maybe there's a day where we can move statewide to an eviction diversion court model. It may not make sense for every justice court. For example, in Moapa Valley, they had one eviction in 2024.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
I appreciate that, and I see that this money certainly is going to both Northern Nevada, Southern Nevada and then out into rurals for that. I appreciate you also answering probably what was going to be my next question, which was is this just somebody being able to pay whatever their back rent is? But you spoke about the wraparound services, so I appreciate the opportunity to just make sure we knew exactly what these programs were and that they were ongoing.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Can you speak to the fiscal note just a little bit?

MR. NORMAN:
So, the bill started, I think, at $25 million, and my understanding from Assemblymember Daniele Monroe-Moreno is that there were negotiations to bring that appropriation down to what is before you, and it is just an appropriation. There's no fiscal note from a state agency or a local government.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
So, the bottom line will be …

MR. NORMAN:
It will be $21 million. The numbers break down to $15 million for Clark County, $5,250,000 for the City of Reno. Mr. Ciccone is here, but the City of Reno serves the entire Washoe Valley. There is language in here making sure that the criteria for getting rental assistance does not change if you are in the City of

Reno, the City of Sparks or unincorporated Washoe County. Then $750,000 goes to the Rural Housing Authority, so the total would be $21 million.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go to those in support of Assembly Bill 475.

NIC CICCONE (City of Reno):
I just want to go on the record saying we support this bill. Last session, when we were able to amend A.B. No. 396 of the 82nd Session to give the City of Reno rental assistance dollars, that was probably one of the proudest moments of my life. We have used this funding.

Last session, we were appropriated $3 million, and we used that for 1,400 families within the City of Reno, the City of Sparks and Washoe County. Again, we run a regional program for the entire region, and we support this bill and appreciate your consideration.

JOANNA JACOB (Clark County):
We are in support of the continued funding. We have been partnering, as Mr. Norman detailed, with legal aid and the courts in Southern Nevada on this program. I just wanted to give you an update on the funding that was appropriated last session under A.B. No. 396 of the 82nd Session to Clark County. We have been working on that and subcontracted to two subcontractors—HopeLink of Southern Nevada and HELP of Southern Nevada; both are on track to spend our existing allocation by June 30.

We will be reporting to you by September under the terms of that bill on our final results, but this funding will help us continue this program. We have served, from the end of April, 2,451 households under eviction prevention throughout the Las Vegas Valley and 585 households under our fixed income, which largely helps people who have fixed income, meaning seniors on SSI [Supplemental Security Income] and people who cannot adapt to market trends. Thank you very much for the continued support for this program. We are in support of this bill.

HARRISON BOHN (HopeLink of Southern Nevada):
We are here in support of A.B. 475. I want to provide the committee here with some fiscal stats. I know this is the money committee, so we will make it happen. HopeLink is the lead distributor of rental assistance in Southern Nevada

and provided over $7.4 million to landlords and property managers in 2024. On average, HopeLink sends about $5,500 to stabilize a household and prevent homelessness. The majority of these households do not need any further services. I believe that number is roughly 90 percent.

A 2017 study by Help Hope Home revealed that individuals experiencing homelessness cost the community over $70,000 in public services, whether that is being incarcerated or just going to the hospital or the ER. We appreciate the bipartisan support around eviction diversion and thank the sponsor and the body for recognizing this important effort.

CADENCE MATIJEVICH (Washoe County):
I am here in support of the bill today and want to thank Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno for her continued advocacy for eviction diversion funding. As you heard from Mr. Ciccone from the City of Reno, they have really taken the lead on this issue in Northern Nevada and in the Truckee Meadows. They've done a great job. We would be most grateful to see additional funding come to Northern Nevada and let them continue the good work that they've been doing on behalf of our entire region.

KATIE COLEMAN (Communications Director, Nevada Rural Housing):
I would like to express strong support for A.B. 475. Since launching our emergency rental assistance program in 2021, we have built a proven responsive system to help get Nevadans who need it most quickly, securely and with real accountability. In just the past two years alone, we have helped 465 households stay safely housed in rural and frontier communities across the State.

Programs like this don't offer just relief; they prevent homelessness. They give families a chance to stabilize, recover and then move forward. We stand ready to continue to do this work. With your support, we can keep more Nevadans housed, and that is exactly what Nevada needs.

MENDY ELLIOTT (Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority):
I'm here this morning to express our strong support for Assembly Bill 475. This bill provides critical and powerful resources and $15 million for Clark County to prevent evictions and promote housing stability. Every day, we see how close many families are to homelessness. Eviction diversion programs help us to

intervene early, keep people housed and avoid the devastating personal and social cost of displacement.

This bill supports solutions that are both cost-effective and humane. We applaud the Legislature and especially our sponsor Assemblymember Daniele Monroe-Moreno for recognizing the urgency of this issue. We urge your support and stand ready to partner in implementing these funds quickly and equitably. We appreciate your supporting the needs of our most vulnerable Nevadans.

MAURICE PAGE (Executive Director, Nevada Housing Coalition):
We are in support of A.B. 475. We appreciate the hard work that Assemblymember Daniele Monroe-Moreno has put into this. As we know, with the unemployment rate still increasingly high and the surge in homelessness since the pre-pandemic days, this funding will ultimately go toward helping individuals and families stay in their homes. We strongly support this bill to move forward.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no one wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 475, we will open neutral testimony.

JESSICA GOODEY (Las Vegas Township Justice Court, Department 6, Clark County):
I am here to testify in neutral because it is a policy position. We can't testify in support, but I would like to reiterate the success of the program in Las Vegas Justice Court and provide maybe a little additional information about our goals for the program going forward.

We are looking to expand the program to encompass our mobile home communities which currently have not been eligible to receive the assistance. We are also looking at extending it to families with young children to again cover some of our more vulnerable populations. I do not have stats with me on the success of the program, but I do believe that our representative from Clark County provided that.

KENDRA BERTSCHY (Reno Township Justice Court, Department 2, Washoe County):
I am a judge in Reno Justice Court, and I have the privilege of presiding over our eviction diversion court. I will not go over all the details of our program, but I

am happy to answer questions about the holistic approach that we take to providing wraparound services to those individuals with therapeutic interventions to promote long-term stability.

I do want to just mention that with the City of Reno's assistance, as well as Nation's Finest [veteran services], we've been able to allocate and provide over $500,000 from the appropriation that was provided through A.B. No. 396 of the 82nd Session. Based on a survey from [Nevada] HAND [housing and neighborhood development] with the City of Reno, they have been able to keep—just through our addiction diversion courts—80 percent of those who did not receive the eviction still housed after a period of time. Through Nation's Finest, 100 percent of the veterans who were assisted utilizing this program remained housed. Thank you for hearing this bill.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Thank you very much. Seeing no one else wishing to testify on this bill, we will close the hearing on A.B. 475 and open the hearing on A.B. 575.

ASSEMBLY BILL 575 (1st Reprint): Makes appropriations to the Department of Public Safety for the replacement of computer hardware, equipment and associated software, vehicles and furniture and for information technology projects and a recruiting campaign. (BDR S-1213)

KRISTEN DEFER (Deputy Director, Nevada Department of Public Safety):
We are here to present Assembly Bill 575, which makes appropriations to the Department of Public Safety (DPS) for the replacement of computer hardware, equipment and associated software, vehicles, furniture, information technology projects and a recruiting campaign. The one-shot appropriation totals $9,441,073 which includes $9,380,138 from the State General Fund and $60,935 from the State Highway Fund. This bill includes requests for multiple DPS divisions.

I can briefly summarize each section, or with respect for the committee's time, we can move directly to any questions that you might have.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I appreciate that, I will just ask members for questions. It's fairly succinctly laid out in the bill and I appreciate that. With that, seeing no one wishing to testify

for, against or in neutral on A.B. 575, we'll close the hearing on A.B. 575, and you get the award for the fastest bill today. We will now hear A.B. 594.

ASSEMBLY BILL 594 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the Department of Taxation. (BDR 32-1130)

SHELLIE HUGHES (Executive Director, Nevada Department of Taxation):
As this committee is aware, the Department of Taxation is currently undertaking a large state modernization project to implement a new integrated tax system for the State of Nevada, known as Project Mint or MINT. With the department's modernization efforts, we have recognized three specific opportunities for the law to adapt to modern applications.

The first modernization goal relates to authorizing electronic notices to taxpayers through the new system, except in circumstances in which the taxpayer opts out, or the law otherwise requires mail or personal service. The electronic delivery of such communications is expected to result in a budgetary efficiency measure by savings in paper, printing and mail delivery costs. The department's budget to the Legislature included Decision Unit E233 with a savings of $22,344 in each fiscal year of the biennium for these cost savings.

Second, with the new system, the department is able to distribute revenues much earlier on a cash accounting basis. As a result, the department is requesting an earlier due date by approximately 10 days for businesses to file and pay their Sales and Use Tax to the department. This will ensure more timely distribution of revenues from specific filing periods. This change would only affect taxable periods on or after January 1, 2026, to provide sufficient time for taxpayers to adapt to the new timeline.

Finally, the department has recognized outdated statutes when programming and configuring the new system for the upcoming implementation in December relating to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) categories applicable to tax rates for the Commerce Tax accordingly. This bill adopts the most recent version of the NAICS published by the U.S. Census Bureau. We are available to answer any questions you may have.

SENATOR TITUS:
Thank you for the presentation. I was just wondering why she is in front of the fiscal? Is it because of your fiscal note or because we're saving money? There's no fiscal note or money, please?

MS. HUGHES:
Yes, we needed to change certain provisions in our statute to allow us to do the electronic delivery. This is an efficiency measure, and we'll have a cost savings. It is in front of the fiscal committee, I think, because of those efficiency savings, and it's a budget implementation.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:
Even when you are saving money, you get to come before us. We will take support testimony for A.B. 594.

BECKY DUTRO (Nevada Taxpayers Association):
The Nevada Taxpayers Association testified in the neutral position during the first hearing of the bill as introduced. The main concern was the original effective date of July 1 and the short amount of time taxpayers would have to make necessary changes. With the amendment and the effective date for sections 6 and 7 of January 1, 2026, that concern has been alleviated. We thank the department and Chair Shea Backus for the continued dialogue and introduction of the amendment. Thank you to the committee for your time and consideration.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Thank you very much. Seeing no one else wishing to testify for, against or in neutral on this bill, we will close the hearing on A.B. 594.

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 108.

ASSEMBLY BILL 108 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program Account. (BDR S-875)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER SANDRA JAUREGUI (Assembly District No. 41):
The Nevada Outdoor Education and Recreation Grant Program (NOER) established in 2019 has been instrumental in offering our youth meaningful experiences in nature. I want to thank Speaker Steve Yeager, my cosponsor, for introducing A.B. No. 331 of the 80th Session that passed and created NOER to

give our underserved Nevada students the opportunity to experience Nevada's great outdoors while promoting education and health.

This program aims to enhance academic achievement and personal wellness while instilling a deep appreciation for our public lands. Research consistently shows that outdoor learning environments contribute significantly to a student's mental health. Engaging with nature has also been linked to increased prosocial behavior, reduced hyperactivity and decreased mental health struggles. I know I do not post as much as my cosponsor does, but I am usually alongside him; and over the years, we have hiked so many places together. We have hiked 6,000 feet down the Grand Canyon and back up; we have hiked to the highest peak in Nevada together, Boundary Peak; we hiked Mount Whitney and were so close to reaching the top of Mount Whitney, but unfortunately the weather took a turn for the worse.

Just a couple of weekends ago, we had an epic hike where we covered 30 miles of Nevada's mountains and over 4,000 feet in a weekend. I say this because I know that some of my happiest times are when I am outside enjoying our public lands, and I want that to be true for every child in Nevada, no matter what background they come from or no matter what part of Nevada they live in—that they also get to experience Nevada's great outdoors.

CHRISTI CABRERA-GEORGESON (Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League):
The NOER grant program is housed under the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Outdoor Recreation and provides underserved youth with high quality outdoor education and recreation opportunities. During the 2023 Legislative Session, NOER received state funding for the very first time, investing $500,000 over a two-year period. While advocating for funding last session, the Division of Outdoor Recreation predicted this level of funding would be able to fund approximately 13 grantees and around 2,400 youth each year. However, they have far exceeded those expectations, reaching nearly 11,000 kids with 26,000 hours spent outside in 2024 alone.

I am looking forward to getting those 2025 numbers at the end of the year. Over the biennium, NOER will have funded 44 projects in every single county across the State. I just submitted all of those programs as well as the impact report to NELIS [Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System], (Exhibit C, Exhibit D and Exhibit E contain copyrighted material. Originals are available upon

request from the Research Library.), so hopefully that will be in your inboxes shortly.

The Nevada Conservation League reached out to many of the NOER awardees to hear how this funding impacted their work. We heard stories about a program supporting underserved girls in STEM who were able to take part in an outdoor education camp for science and outdoor learning. Another awardee took students from Title I schools to Clark County on field trips to Red Rock Canyon, and 1,400 students were able to experience Red Rock Canyon, many for the very first time. Another program provided equine therapy to children in foster care and kids with disabilities. Several others created opportunities for cultural revitalization for Indigenous youth.

We heard from teachers about students learning to "Leave No Trace" and returning from the outdoors, rejuvenated, happy and ready to learn. Every story, while unique, had an underlying message—these programs positively changed the lives of every single student they touched and would not have happened without the funding from NOER. We're grateful to have played a role in securing that funding and are excited to be here today, advocating for continued funding for the program.

Assembly Bill 108 will make a $500,000 appropriation to this program over the biennium, or $250,000 in each year, maintaining the level of funding from the previous biennium.

I urge you all to think about the very first time you saw the glistening waters of Lake Tahoe, the stunning shades of red in the Valley of Fire or the majestic peaks of the Ruby Mountains. These moments have brought an irreplaceable sense of joy for myself and so many others across the State and have instilled in us a reason to care about the natural areas around us. Our students deserve that same opportunity. We urge the members of the committee to support A.B. 108.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Thank you very much, and I appreciate your bill, Majority Leader. I chuckle because when we were kids, this is what we did. I mean, we did not have devices, we did not have a television in every room, right? This is what we did. And so we have come full circle.

GRACE MICHAELSON (Western Resource Advocates):
We are in strong support of this measure due to the immense benefits outdoor education provides to Nevada's youth. We'd like to thank the Majority Leader for her commitment to this issue and urge your committee's support of A.B. 108.

SHANE PICCININI:
I am testifying on this just for myself, but I just wanted to say that I am incredibly grateful that the Legislature is considering opportunities like this. I am old. I grew up crawling around all these mountains, and I really wish that when I was younger, I had focused programs like this that allowed us to be outside in a more constructive way. So, thank you for considering this bill.

LEANN MCALLISTER (Executive Director, Nevada Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics):
There's a high return on investment for children's development and having time to play outside. I am very excited to see this legislation hopefully move forward.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Okay, seeing no more testimony on A.B. 108, we will close the hearing and we're going to quick jump to Assembly Bill 331.

ASSEMBLY BILL 331 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Department of Health and Human Services for a grant program to expand the biennial survey administered pursuant to the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention of the United States Department of Health and Human Services. (BDR S-1044)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER TRACY BROWN-MAY (Assembly District No. 42):
This bill is really exciting for me. Assembly Bill 331 is the only bill that I put in this session that is a direct appropriation request to fund a youth behavioral risk assessment. We currently provide, as a state, parts of this youth behavioral risk assessment, and we are reaching only a portion of middle schools. This appropriation will allow the current assessment to be expanded to all middle schools, including tribal schools.

We all know that there are a number of mental health disparities throughout our State, and we are all working hard to be able to address the needs of our

population. This will help to identify potential risk behaviors for kids beginning in middle school. Once we have this data, it's utilized throughout divisions and organizations around the State to bring in additional dollars.

So, while our appropriation request is $220,000 for fiscal year (FY) 2025 -2026 and $220,000 for FY 2026-2027, the ROI [return on investment] on this investment is incredible. Federal funding received during FY 2024-2025 relied heavily on the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) data that included a substance use block grant totaling over $20 million, a mental health block grant totaling $11.2 million, a strategic prevention framework of $1.2 million, cooperative agreements for tribal youth suicide prevention and early intervention programs at $735,000. The list goes on.

The more comprehensive our data is with regard to youth behavioral risk assessments, the more money we can bring in to address the health needs that we have in the State. We're really excited about it. The University of Nevada, Reno, (UNR) helps to coordinate this. The appropriation request goes through a state division, so the State is then able to deploy the dollars where it's necessary. I am happy to stand for questions.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
So the total appropriation is the $440,000?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
That is correct.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
And that sets up the survey, the actual doing of the project?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
That builds out the existing survey that we have so that we reach the remaining parts of the population we have not yet been able to reach.

MS. CHARLTON:
On behalf of NSHE, we urge your support of A.B. 331.

SHEILA BRAY (University of Nevada, Reno):
Of course we are here in support. Just to give you a little bit more contextual data, as Assemblymember Brown-May said, this will help the expansion of this

survey to reach the other high schools and all the middle schools that are not currently being surveyed. In 2023, the survey was distributed to 121 middle schools and 99 high schools with over 12,000 student responses, making Nevada the second state with the highest response rate in the country.

This funding is super needed at this point as expanded funding is not guaranteed. In fact, this last March over $57,000 in federal pass-through was cut, so this is needed now more than ever.

AMY HYNE-SUTHERLAND (Nevada Association of Counties):
We are in support. Counties use the YRBS data for opioid needs assessments and planning, community health needs assessments and planning. It is a vital resource in all our communities.

LEO BENAVIDES (University of Nevada, Las Vegas):
We are also in support of A.B. 331.

LOGAN CAYTON (Southern Nevada Health District):
We support the appropriation for the YRBS because it provides critical data to guide and strengthen youth-focused public health efforts. For example, YRBS data has allowed us to identify rising middle school vaping trends and respond with targeted school-based and digital counter marketing campaigns. We also rely on YRBS information to track progress on chronic disease prevention, form grant applications and share data with the community through a Healthy Southern Nevada dashboard.

SABRINA SCHNUR (Nevada Public Health Association; Nevada Primary Care Association):
I represent the Nevada Public Health Association and the Nevada Primary Care Association, the State's federally qualified health centers. They have run the teen pregnancy prevention grant for eight years now, and that is heavily informed by YRBS data. So, we are in full support.

MS. MCALLISTER:
On behalf of our 290 pediatrician members, we are in strong support of this bill.

CARI HERINGTON (Executive Director, Nevada Cancer Coalition):
We heavily rely on YRBS as a critical tool regarding tobacco and vape use. It really guides public health efforts and works to prevent initiation of these

obviously very dangerous and cancer-causing items. Our members very much support this bill.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no one wishing to offer opposition or neutral testimony, we will close the hearing on A.B. 331 and open the hearing on A.B. 375.

ASSEMBLY BILL 375 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to intoxicating liquor. (BDR 32-1049)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER STEVE YEAGER (Assembly District No. 9):
I have next to me, Mr. Peter Saba from the Nevada Restaurant Association. I have worked quite extensively on this bill with him, and he will have a little bit of data to share with you about what we are trying to do. Essentially, you may remember during COVID—that time in our lives when things got really interesting—that we actually allowed, as a state, alcohol delivery from restaurants and to-go cocktails. We stopped doing that after COVID.

This bill would essentially reauthorize what we're calling "cocktails to go." So that could either be picking up cocktails when you're ordering food or having a restaurant or delivery platform deliver those to you. It sets up a framework here where no one would have to do this, but the board of county commissioners of a county or the city may enact an ordinance allowing for this. Restaurants would not be required to do this. It would simply be an opt-in, but we think it's good for a number of reasons.

Number one, it should help our small businesses generate some additional revenue. We hope, as well, that it will cut down on folks who are driving under the influence of alcohol. I don't think it is a surprise that sometimes when people are having a good time and they run out, they make a very poor decision to get in their car and go find some more alcohol because from most places you can't get it delivered.

In addition, there is a user fee associated with this concept where the Department of Taxation would come up with regulations and would be able to charge up to 50 cents per drink that is ordered in a to-go fashion. That money is earmarked for an already existing DUI account that exists in our statutes. We worked with the folks who are in control of that DUI account to expand some of

the language of the uses. So, we think there are two different concepts here and both will be helpful.

Finally, I don't have him with me here right now, but Assemblymember Bert Gurr is a cosponsor. Section 5 of the bill was his idea originally; that is to designate picon punch as the official drink of the State of Nevada. So, we put these two concepts together.

As far as the fiscal impacts, I will let you know that there were some fiscal notes in the Assembly Ways and Means Committee from the Department of Taxation and DETR [Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation], and we were able to get those mitigated through amendments that were made to the bill. So, there are no appropriations, and there is no longer a fiscal impact.

You'll note in the bill that the Department of Taxation can use some of the fee monies to pay for their position, so essentially it will pay for itself.

PETER SABA (Nevada Restaurant Association):
The Nevada Restaurant Association represents thousands of Nevada small business owners, employees and restaurant families. Assembly Bill 375 is pro-business, pro safety and pro Nevada, and it modernizes Nevada's liquor laws by allowing restaurants to safely sell and deliver alcohol to go, mirroring existing provisions passed by this Legislature in 2021 for big chain grocery stores and liquor retailers.

It's not about cutting corners or weakening oversight; it's about leveling the playing field, supporting our restaurant industry and implementing a policy that is smart, regulated and modern. This bill ensures that Nevada does not get left behind. It delivers a balanced solution that strengthens our economy, respects local control and builds in strict safeguards Nevadans accept and deserve.

In 2020, when restaurants were forced to close their dining rooms during the pandemic, Nevada temporarily allowed alcohol to go. We saw immediately the benefits—restaurants stayed afloat, workers remained employed, and consumers enjoyed a responsible, safe way to enjoy beverages at home while ordering takeout. That temporary measure ended here in Nevada.

However, since then, over 30 states have adopted long-term alcohol-to-go policies, including states like Texas, New York, California, Florida and as of last week, Utah and Vermont. They have moved forward; Nevada has not. That is what A.B. 375 aims to change, ensuring Nevada does not get left behind.

Assembly Bill 375 modernizes Nevada's liquor laws in a way that's both responsible and fair. It allows restaurants to sell and deliver alcoholic beverages to go in sealed tamper-evident packaging, ensuring customers enjoy the same convenience already available from liquor and grocery stores. This bill doesn't remove oversight; it enhances it. Every step includes a safety check, every actor is accountable.

Under section 1, local governments can now authorize restaurants and delivery services to sell and deliver alcohol in sealed containers but only within the jurisdictions where they are licensed. That is local control, preserved and protected. It's important to note that the State is already dealing with these complexities for retail and grocery store alcohol deliveries, and this bill maintains that existing framework. The apps themselves are designed to enforce jurisdictional boundaries, preventing deliveries outside of an unauthorized area.

Section 1, subsection 2 creates a 50-cent surcharge per drink dedicated to funding the Ignition Interlock and DUI Reduction Program (IID). This is not a tax on the general public. It is a user fee that goes directly into DUI enforcement, rehabilitation services, case management, police officer training and statewide data systems. Subsection 3 clarifies that certain provisions governing the transport of liquor, including those requiring a specific license for liquor transport, do not apply to deliveries made under an ordinance enacted by local governments for covered food establishment. This streamlines the delivery process for these new sales.

Section 5 proudly celebrates Nevada's heritage by designating the picon punch as the official state drink.

Section 5.5 expands the DUI program, funding treatment, outreach, case management and law enforcement training.

Finally, the bill includes an important amendment for Nevada's craft distilleries. It allows those with contracts in place before January 1, 2025, to apply for a

certificate under section 1.5, manufacturing an additional 40,000 cases per year for exportation to another state.

Under section 5.7, they can serve samples on-site, and sell limited retail directly from the distillery.

We are not asking the Legislature to make a speculative decision here. The demand is already here nationally. Over 90 percent of restaurants in states where alcohol to go is legal now offer it, and more than half of consumers say it influences their take-out decisions.

This is not just about convenience; it's about survival. In many restaurants, alcohol accounts for up to 80 percent of profit margins while food averages just 5 percent. Without that margin, many simply can't stay open. This bill creates an equitable opportunity for restaurants to not just survive but to grow. As Mimi Butler, owner of Buenos Grill in Reno, put it, "This opens up a whole new market that was not there before." For Kyle Vannucci, General Manager at Michoacan Gourmet Mexican Restaurant down south, it is simply a way to stay connected with customers. This bill supports workers, responds to consumer demand and does all of this without compromising public safety.

Assembly Bill 375 includes robust safety measures, leveraging technology and proven practices. First, it requires all to-go alcoholic beverages to be sealed with tamper-evident packaging. This isn't about locking down a drink until it gets home; it's about setting a clear visible standard that protects everyone involved. Tamper-evident technology across every industry has one purpose—to show whether something has been opened or altered. What it does is create a point of proof, something objective, visible and enforceable.

Let's be honest, anyone determined to drink behind the wheel can already buy a $2 tall can at 7-Eleven or pour vodka into a hydro flask. That behavior exists with or without this bill. What this bill does is protect the people doing the right thing—the honest, law-abiding customer who picks up dinner and a cocktail to go, drives straight home and never opens a drink in the car. Without a seal, that person could still face an open-container violation.

Tamper-evident packaging gives them that protection. It protects law enforcement by giving officers a visual cue. It protects restaurants and delivery drivers by showing they followed the law. Most importantly, it ensures that if

someone chooses to violate the law, they, and only they, are held accountable, not the restaurant that followed every rule, not the delivery driver who verified the ID and not the bill that made the service possible.

This is a practical, proven safeguard. It doesn't pretend to prevent bad behavior. It gives everyone involved the tools to act responsibly and be protected when they do. On top of what is built into this bill, we are already using the systems that work right here in Nevada. Platforms like Uber Eats, DoorDash and Grubhub already use multistep ID verification to deliver alcohol from grocery and liquor stores, and they have done so successfully in Nevada for over five years.

These systems require scanning a government-issued ID, verifying age at the point of delivery and confirming the recipient is physically present. No alcohol is left at the door; no delivery is completed without a verified ID. Furthermore, delivery platforms, for their own liability, require their drivers to complete additional rigorous training specific to alcohol delivery. This training covers recognizing intoxication, verifying IDs, handling refusals and proper transport. While each platform may have it is own modules, they are all designed to meet or exceed state standards and prevent liability, ensuring a consistent focus on safe delivery practices across the industry.

If a delivery is refused due to intoxication or lack of a valid ID, the driver takes the product back to the restaurant or store, and the customer is charged a return fee covering the driver's time and gas, just as the restaurant would handle a returned item in a dining room. These are not pilot programs; they are in place every day under existing law.

Assembly Bill 375 allows restaurants to use the same proven systems, applying tested technology to a new setting with the same level of accountability. Together, the safeguards make alcohol to go not just legal but safe, responsible and fully enforceable.

When we talk about public safety, we do not need to rely on hypotheticals. We can look at what is happening right now in our own backyard. This year, Nevada has seen an increase of 8 percent in fatal crashes. Impairment was a factor in 60 percent of those fatalities. Lyon County saw a 33 percent increase. Washoe County saw a 78 percent spike. We know that expanding access to alcohol brings questions. We share those concerns. That's why we looked at the data and not assumptions.

Between 2019 and 2021, DUI fatalities rose 53.63 percent in states that prohibited alcohol to go. In the states that allowed it, the increase was just 12.5 percent. That is not a coincidence. It turns out that when you give people the option to drink at home, they are less likely to take the risk of getting behind the wheel. While it is hard to predict individual behavior, the aggregate data strongly suggests that providing a legal, convenient and safe alternative to impaired driving has a positive effect on public safety outcomes. Just as importantly, this strategy aligns with where Nevada is already going.

The Nevada Department of Public Safety's Office of Traffic Safety is currently updating the statewide impaired driving program. That plan recognizes the need for modern tools, modern enforcement and modern choices. Assembly Bill 375 fits directly into that vision. Independent research from the R Street Institute, the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism all confirm the same thing—a responsible alcohol to-go policy is not just good economics, it's a smart, enforceable and effective public strategy.

Beyond improving public safety, A.B. 375 is a major economic driver for Nevada's restaurant industry. Based on real-world case studies, the average licensed restaurant sells over 127 to-go drinks per week. Multiplying that across Nevada's roughly 3,500 liquor-licensed restaurants, that's an estimated 438,000 drinks sold each week and over 23 million drinks annually, all under a safe, regulated system. At an average of $13 per drink, that translates to $286 million in new revenue flowing directly into Nevada's restaurant economy.

This isn't a hypothetical; it's rooted in real business behavior and customer demand. This is real money flowing into our local economy directly supporting jobs and strengthening the communities that depend on our restaurant industry. With this new projected revenue, A.B. 375 will generate an estimated $25 million annually in new sales tax revenue and $11 million more through the IID surcharge dedicated directly to DUI prevention efforts.

All this happens without raising a single tax. This is policy that pays for itself while funding public safety at a scale. It creates more work for bartenders, servers, delivery drivers and supports 223,000 Nevada food and beverage jobs, keeping our economy moving forward. We're not reinventing the wheel here. More than 30 states have already passed similar legislation. They've seen increased restaurant revenue. They've seen strong customer support, and they've seen no significant public safety issues.

If we fail to act now, Nevada risks falling behind. But if we pass A.B. 375, we send a clear forward-looking message—Nevada supports innovation, Nevada supports small businesses, and Nevada supports policies that are smart and safe. Other states are moving forward. Shouldn't Nevada lead rather than lag behind? We already have the delivery systems and the enforcement tools. What we need now is the policy that lets our restaurants compete, the policy that keeps our public safe and the policy that keeps Nevada moving forward.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I am one of those people that probably utilizes things like DoorDash and those food delivery systems probably too much. I do recall that during the pandemic, it was very useful to be able to have those drinks delivered during that time. I've been to other cities, and I know that a lot of other cities have this. I do have some concerns about what kind of protections are in place or what kind of protections that you think are in statute or are directed in statute for the development of these regulations on the local level, for example, provisions to protect my teenager from using my app and having alcohol delivered to our house. Not that my perfect children would do that, but if that was the case, how would there be protections?

I'm assuming there are some protections in law because I know we do delivery of cannabis and weed to our homes right now, and that is in statute. So, I do not see a huge jump for this, but I am wondering what kind of protections you can point us to that give us that as well.

MR. SABA:
Like I said in the hearing, these food delivery apps already have rigorous training for their delivery drivers who want to participate in alcohol delivery. They train them on how to see if someone is too intoxicated and shouldn't be served more. They also train on verifying ID. The apps themselves have a verified ID system where they scan the ID and make sure that person is you. So, unless your kid looks like you, they are going to hopefully be trained enough to pick that apart and make sure that is not the person who ordered this drink under that account.

Currently, the State has allowed this for grocery stores and liquor stores on those apps in certain jurisdictions. In the original bill, I believe that it was S.B. No. 207 [307] of the 81st Session in 2021, that bill allowed the

Department of Taxation to come up with the regulations and let the local authorities expand on what they want to add on top of that.

In our case, if Clark County wants to choose what kind of actual seals to use and Washoe County does not really care, as long as it's full security tape or actual tamper-evident tape, we're leaving that up to them to decide. They have been doing this already for five years. In the original print of this bill, we have changed that very much to let this bill, if passed, slide into the ordinance they already have. This was on behalf of Clark County, and that is what they wanted. We took their recommendation and cut down on it. If they want to choose to not allow delivery to casinos, churches, parks or colleges, they can pick and choose to do that. This is just giving the framework of allowing them to let restaurants deliver just as they do grocery stores and liquor stores.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
For stores like liquor stores and grocery stores in some jurisdictions, there's enabling language currently in statute that allows them to do alcohol delivery if they go through the local jurisdictions. It's just alcohol delivery from restaurants that this bill is limited to expanding what we already do in state law. Is that correct?

MR. SABA:
That is absolutely correct. I believe Clark County is the only jurisdiction that doesn't allow the third-party delivery apps to currently deliver and only allows the stores themselves to deliver. But I believe from our conversations from the start of this bill that they are well on their way to allowing the third-party delivery. But in Clark County right now, Lee's Discount Liquor employees would be allowed to deliver to a household.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
So, without this law, are restaurants not able to do this? Is the law so specific that it's limited to liquor stores and grocery stores?

MR. SABA:
That is exactly correct. There was a carveout for restaurants. The language specifically says "retail stores" in that bill.

SENATOR TITUS:
I appreciate the multiple components of this bill, but I do have questions regarding section 5.7 because you're going way beyond a delivery of a mixed drink when you order a dinner and have a drink or a cocktail with it.

In section 5.7, you are changing the craft distillery laws. I'm just curious if you might address where that is and what the purpose of it is. In current law, it says the craft distillery can't use spirits manufactured at that craft distillery if they are derived from neutral spirits by another craft manufacturer. But then you say the person may manufacture an exclusive distilled spirit of the person using neutral distilled spirits manufactured by another manufacturer. So I need a little explanation, please.

JESSE WADHAMS (Ferino Distillery):
Ferino Distillery, as you know, is taking over the production of Amer Picon for production of picon punches in Nevada. Under the craft distillery laws as they are currently written, a craft distiller cannot use neutral or distilled spirits for their products. In order to make Amer Picon at scale, you need to bring in what I'll call bulk alcohol, which is neutral or distilled spirits. So, what we're doing is allowing for a craft distillery to bring in bulk alcohol, neutral or distilled spirits and then make Amer Picon from that. It is an exclusive license.

SENATOR TITUS:
So that would be just limited to those folks making the critical component for the picon punch?

MR. WADHAMS:
That is, at this point, correct, but any contract would be potentially ....

SENATOR TITUS:
Well, I hope it does increase supply because there certainly is demand. True story, down in Gardnerville where there are several Basque restaurants, I went to have a picon at one of the local restaurants, and they didn't have the key ingredients to produce picon.

MR. WADHAMS:
Senator, I know there's no question in there, but that is exactly why we're doing this so that we can get production ramped up and start selling picons everywhere.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Suppose my children know the Wadham's children, one of my children is 22 and the Wadham's children are 16, and they decide to have alcohol. My children can order because they are legal, and your children are not old enough to drink. So, if we order pizza and whatever, how does that work?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER YEAGER: ‘
For the record, I don't think I'm going to give you a satisfactory answer other than that the checks are in place to make sure that it gets delivered to the right person or the right person picks it up because this also involves take out where you go pick up the drinks yourself. What a consumer decides to do after that point, I don't know that we can control that. I would just know that it's not really any different than someone who's 22 or 23 going to the liquor store, and bringing it home and sharing it inappropriately.

I think this bill puts as many safeguards as we can on the actual who's going to pick it up or who's going to deliver and how it is going to be delivered. We're not going to have a situation where it gets delivered to the wrong person or it gets left on the porch. When I do DoorDash, I always tell them just leave it on the front porch. They can't do that with alcohol. They don't do it now when it is delivered, and they would not do it under this either. It's going to fall back to that personal responsibility. If you're providing alcohol to a minor, that is a crime in and of itself. We try to educate and hope people do the right thing, but we can't prevent that from happening.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
My concern, of course, is always kids, but, but beyond that, with adults, I just do not know that I personally believe that just because I order alcohol, I'm not going to go out and drink and drive. Because what generally happens is you drink two or three drinks, and then you say, "Oh, you know, we should have more, let's go drive and get more"; because, by the way, the guy who's been delivering it to you, it probably is not going to come because you are inebriated.

I just worry about all those safeguards. I recognize what is going on and I recognize that adults, like all of us, may want to take part. I guess if I am out picking up food, I can certainly swing by the grocery store or the CVS or wherever and get the beer or whatever I need for a drink. I'm just not sure that this ramps up production. I am just not sure that is where we are going with this. I just have some real concerns, I guess, and it's always around the

unintended consequences of bills. I appreciate you bringing it, I am just a little bit concerned.

SENATOR BUCK:
Is this open for mom-and-pop bars, or do you have to sell food? Can a mom-and-pop store or bar also do this?

MR. SABA:
In the bill, the language says, "covered food establishment." It is kind of vague, so it could be a brew pub, a bar—as long as you are under the covered food establishment definition, you can deliver. The local counties keep you allowed to do that.

So, if Clark County wants to only do restaurants and not brew pubs and Washoe County wants everyone who's technically a covered food establishment to do it, they can pick and choose how they do it, and we'll worry about that after the bill is passed. But I envision that every covered food establishment gets to deliver—think brewpubs, think bars, especially the brew pubs that craft their own brews. Those are going to be very popular to be delivered.

I would love for those small businesses to get that kind of revenue stream, not just Olive Garden or Applebee's that will be able to do this as they already don't need more revenue. They already make a ton. Obviously, everyone would love more revenue. Hopefully, we keep those small businesses in there when it comes time to do that on the ordinance level.

SENATOR BUCK:
I was just thinking about the wine bar down the street.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Because we have these two very distinct issues between the distilling and the alcohol delivery, I'm going to focus on the distilling thing, and this might be a question for Mr. Wadhams. The way this is crafted ... I know we've had conversation about a distillery that wanted to be located in Nevada and craft distill the ingredients for a picon. Would this allow anyone to do this or just someone making this particular drink?

MR. WADHAMS:
This is a pretty limited exception. It's not this particular product, but it is a limited license for this particular situation, if that makes sense. A contractual right that existed could be for anything that could fit under this. It does not have to be necessarily Amer Picon; it could be brandy or some other thing that is a component of a different drink. The answer is it is intended to be limited to this situation but not this product.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I will take support testimony for A.B. 375 now.

TREVOR PARRISH (Vegas Chamber):
The Chamber is in support of A.B. 375 from the fiscal perspective as this will help drive additional economic activity. So now let us get our cocktails and drink them, too.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no one wishing to testify in opposition or neutral on this bill, I will close the hearing on A.B. 375 and open the hearing on A.B. 251.

ASSEMBLY BILL 251 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the inspection of meat and poultry. (BDR 51-154)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER GREGORY S. KOENIG (Assembly District No. 38):
Most of my bills have some sort of a rural slant. This was a constituent's bill brought to me about a mobile meatpacking trailer in Yerington that does some pretty good work there, but they're not able to move it. It's a trailer, but it can only stay in its original spot and can't be moved.

What this bill does is it authorizes mobile meat packing plants to be able to move around and to offer their services in different places. It's really going to help in the rurals, especially the ultrarurals that just do not have access to these services. They'll be able to have their livestock ready, and they'll be able to drive the mobile meat packing plant out to them and process their animals. It's only for wholesale.

It's not like we're trying to create competition for other people who sell the meat, but it is going to let them service themselves. Also, some of the small

little ultrarural stores will be able to have some fresh meat to sell to their customers.

Coming out of the Assembly side, there was a fiscal note, but in the hearing in the last couple of days, I can't remember exactly which day, it's all running together at this point, but the State Department of Agriculture and Director Goicoechea were able to remove that fiscal note. He was asked to be completely transparent on how taking this fiscal note off was going to affect the situation. He said, "If we were able to add another employee, we could probably get to people within just a day or two." By taking the fiscal note off and not having to add another employee, it may take a few days longer, but they'll still be able to service the mobile meat plants. I guess they have to inspect the animal before they slaughter it; and then after they slaughter it, that's why you have to have someone from his department to come and inspect, but that is going to be able to happen, and he was able to take that fiscal note off.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
So, this isn't just like I went out and shot a deer, and I don't want to process it myself. Because it seems like if you had a ranch or a farm and you were slaughtering beef or sheep or whatever, you would go to a bigger facility rather than having a mobile slaughterhouse or a mobile meat packer.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER KOENIG:
It will do both. They can do wildlife already, and this would allow them to actually do livestock.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Is there a limit on what they can do? Believe it or not, I have done my share of packing meat. So, when you come home with a deer and you take it apart and you pack it, that is a big job. So, can they do one? Can they do ten? I mean, is there a limit? Because a trailer is what I am thinking.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER KOENIG:
So, you have had experience doing this; I have not. But I've seen the trailer and it's almost in a semitrailer, not just a little small trailer. It's pretty impressive. They have all the things. How much can they do? I don't know. Their goal is not to take over the slaughterhouse's jobs, but it's big enough to me so they can do two or three cows. I am not positive if it is a semi or not.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
You mentioned, something about inspection. Nobody inspects my meat if I bring home a deer, right? But if you have a mobile trailer, you would want somebody inspecting, so is that the health department who does that?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER KOENIG:
It's someone from Director Goicoechea's department trained in that. I think they can inspect the brick-and-mortar places too, but they are going to be the same people that will be inspecting the mobile one.

SENATOR TITUS:
Just a little clarification since I have had little farms and ranches. What we would do, we'd raise a little steer and then hire somebody to come and slaughter it for us, and they would take care of it right there. So, it's that small mom-and-pop family farm that raises one or two beef, and then they need somebody to slaughter it for them. Then this person comes to us, slaughters it there and takes care of it right there.

But, also, people who hunt do not always process. We do process our own meat, but many people take it to a meat packing place and have them cut it up for sausage, and they don't do it themselves. So, this would enable that custom professional to come to your place, take care of your animal and process it for you, just for that clarification.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER KOENIG:
Thank you, Senator, and that is the intent.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
In looking at this, I am not even going to pretend that I came up with it on my own, but I know that staff here has indicated that in section 4, there's some language in subsection 2 that talks about, "If, and only if, Decision Unit E-905 in Budget Account 3194 is enacted by the Legislature." This is some unusual language. Is this something you would be open to amending if your bill was to move forward in order to make this consistent with the actual budget closings?

HUMAN SERVICES

DIVISION OF PUBLIC AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH

DHS-DPBH — Environmental Health Services —Budget Page DHS – DPBH - 80
Budget Account 101-3194

E-905 Transfer From DHS – DPBH – to Agriculture – Page DHS – DPBH - 83

ASSEMBLYMEMBER KOENIG:
Yes, and I thought that part was removed when Director Goicoechea said that he would be able to handle it with his current employees now. I'm not 100 percent sure, but there was the one bill that was going to transfer from the one department into his department.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
It is. It's a budget implementation bill, Senate Bill (S.B.) 466.

SENATE BILL 466 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the authority of the State Department of Agriculture relating to food and water. (BDR 51-1121)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER KOENIG:
So, if that was going to pass, then that was going to take care of the fiscal note, and they would be able to handle it right away. By that not passing, he said fiscally, he can still absorb that, but there might be a little bit of delay. He was talking a few days, not like months, but it was not going to happen immediately without those extra people. I wish he was here to explain that, but he said that he didn't need that to happen anymore for him to take away the fiscal note.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I am going to ask Mr. Thorley to jump in here if you don't mind.

WAYNE THORLEY (Senate Fiscal Analyst):
I think the concern from staff is that tying the effective date of the bill to the approval of the decision unit in the budget is not legally sufficient for determining whether the bill ever becomes effective or not. So, that would need to be changed to either tying it to the passage and approval of S.B. 466 or based on Assemblymember Koenig's testimony just now. If the State Department of Agriculture has indicated that passage of that bill is not needed, then section 4 would just need to be amended to include the regular effective date, whichever effective date is appropriate.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER KOENIG:
I was contacted by Legal saying that wouldn't work. I thought we'd take it out, and then Director Goicoechea said it does not need to depend on that happening for him to take that away. So, we just need to take that out. It's not dependent on this happening for this bill to pass and be effective, and the fiscal note isn't relying on that at this point.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Well, if you could sort that out, we will hang on to it for just a second and will not work session it so we can sort that part out.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER KOENIG:
Thank you. We will get that done right away.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
All right. Those in support of A.B. 251, please come forward.

MS. BRAY:
I represent UNR and we are in full support. We came to Assemblymember Koenig over the interim with this issue that a lot of our folks, mostly in our rural counties, are facing—to be able to have a place for them to process their livestock, their meat, their animals as needed. This legislative session, we actually had our meat trailer outside the Legislative Building and were serving up steak tips. The passage of this bill will really help us to be able to move mountains here in the State.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no testimony in opposition or neutral, we will close the hearing on A.B. 251 and open the hearing on A.B. 409.

ASSEMBLY BILL 409 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to special license plates. (BDR 43-1058)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER GREGORY T. HAFEN (Assembly District No. 36):
I had a rather lengthy PowerPoint for you, however, LCB said that due to copyright restrictions, I was not able to upload it, so I will keep it brief. The fiscal note is zero.

This bill is to create a veteran license plate, the only one that we do not currently have, as well as to add some cleanup from the last legislative session where we allowed decorated veteran plates to be personalized. We had missed a couple of them, so we wanted to expand that to allow our other decorated veterans to also have the ability to personalize their license plate, just like all of the regular license plates. With that, Chair, I could go through the bill step by step or just answer questions, however you would like me to proceed.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
I would just like to know what the fiscal note on this is. Do you have an exact number or not?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAFEN:
The DMV is here to testify, but I believe the fiscal note is zero.

MR. SEVER:
We are neutral on A.B. 409. It is the same testimony as earlier. We put a "cannot be determined" fiscal note earlier in the session because there were nine different license plates coming our way. It's only three now, so it is no impact for the DMV.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Thank you very much. If you'll step back, we will go to those in support of A.B. 409. Seeing no one wishing to testify on this bill, I will close the hearing on A.B. 409 and open the hearing on A.B. 476.

ASSEMBLY BILL 476 (1st Reprint): Makes an appropriation to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. (BDR S-1140)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HOWARD WATTS (Assembly District No. 15):
I am a proud graduate of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), and am fortunate to represent the main UNLV campus. This bill before you would make a $500,000 appropriation in each fiscal year of the upcoming biennium to support the legal clinics at the William S. Boyd School of Law at UNLV. These appropriations would maintain state support at levels that were approved by this body last session. The clinics at the law school provide free legal services to our community while offering students critical real-world legal experience.

One of the key missions at Boyd is to help meet the need for legal services among residents through clinical programs, externships and pro bono services which involve students in community service. There are currently six clinics and practicums in the law school, including survivors of domestic and sexual violence, small business development, immigration, mediation, criminal defense and tenants' rights.

The funds that support these clinics are essential to allow existing pro bono services to continue and allow some of the law school's newer clinics to continue to develop. The law school hopes to also use these funds to support the fellows and staff attorneys that are crucial to keep these clinics running.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Unfortunately, when I was at the Boyd School of Law, they had not started up most of these clinics, although we had some of the community service programs that were kind of pioneered with the founding staff as well as Barbara Buckley and Legal Aid.

I don't know if you might know this answer, but in light of the way we're moving toward new licensure through the State Bar of Nevada—where it will no longer just be the bar exam, but it will be a bar exam that incorporates actual practicum hours in the community during those last years of law school—how crucial are these clinic programs now that we have a new way to become licensed in our State?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER WATTS:
Excellent question. I did not know the answer to this question, but it came up in the Assembly and my friend answered it very well, so I will turn it over to him.

MR. BENAVIDES:
On behalf of UNLV, and also as a Boyd grad as well as somebody who went through the clinic, yes, they will be actually changing the Bar. As you noted, they accepted the Nevada plan, and it will start being in effect next year. As you mentioned, there will be a supervised practice portion requiring students to have 60 hours. So that's why having funding for these clinics will be very important. As you know, these clinics are very popular. These slots fill up very quickly every year. So that is why it is crucial to maintain the funding.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Does the funding go to pay the supervising professor? What does it go to actually? What are the funds needed for? I see the description here as pro bono legal services. What are we doing with those funds?

MR. BENAVIDES:
Yes, it is for providing the services, the program itself, not for the students. The students themselves earn the externship credits through the clinic.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
If you didn't get the $500,000 a year, or $1 million in the biennium, or if you got a lesser amount, how would that affect what you do? How do you fund this if you don't have that money?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER WATTS:
As I noted in my opening remarks, we approved this amount—a total of $1 million with $500,000 in each year of the biennium that is currently ending. So if we weren't able to continue that support, likely there would have to be reductions in the funding that supports those critical staff members. That likely means less opportunities for students in the law school to participate, and then that consequently means less access to the pro bono legal help for the community, whether it is starting a business, assisting survivors of domestic violence, etcetera.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Am I correct in understanding that the money being utilized now that we allocated during the last biennium, as well as this, is allowing those programs to continue because they weren't included in this most recent budget recommendation?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER WATTS:
That's correct.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
And in these clinical programs, it's not like law students are just out there practicing law. They have to be under the supervision of actual practicing attorneys.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER WATTS:
That's also correct.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
All right, with that, we will ask for those who are in support in Carson City.

ALEJANDRO RODRIGUEZ (Nevada System of Higher Education):
The Nevada System of Higher Education is in strong support of this legislation. We'd like to thank Assemblymember Watts for bringing it forward to maintain the amazing services and opportunities that these clinics provide to our students.

MICHAEL FLORES (University of Nevada Reno):
We are here in strong support and grateful for the work that UNLV legal clinic does. We partner a lot with them, and they do great work statewide.

AUSTIN LIPSON:
I graduated from Boyd this year, and I have worked in the legal clinic. In my opinion, the clinic offers the most powerful training experience at the law school. It not only provides students an opportunity to work on extremely high-stakes cases, but it often allows students to see those cases through from beginning to end, which is a rare and extremely informative process for a law student. Clinic cases give students a chance to practice a litany of lawyering skills such as research, evidence preparation, witness interviewing, interfacing with government agencies, litigation and so on.

So important are the skills that a student sharpens in the Thomas and Mack Legal Clinic that I know a lot of students who worked in the clinic, even though they ultimately don't plan on practicing in the area of law that they focused on there; they just knew that working there would make them better lawyers. Aside from serving as a powerful training tool, the Thomas and Mack Legal Clinic also provides students at the law school with a service opportunity that is unmatched by any other programs.

To illustrate this point, I will share what I told the law school's first-year students about the program last month. The clinic allowed my practice partner and I to use the law to save someone's life. The work I did in the clinic is the thing I am most proud of that I have ever done. So in some ways, the Thomas and Mack Legal Clinic is invaluable for turning law students into skilled lawyers,

and it provides life-saving services to the clients that it helps. So please vote in favor of A.B. 476 to fund the clinic.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no more people wanting to testify for, against or neutral, I will close the hearing on A.B. 476 and open the hearing on A.B. 550.

ASSEMBLY BILL 550 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing incompetent criminal defendants. (BDR 14-1120)

DREW CROSS (State Forensic Program Coordinator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services):
We'd like to offer a brief overview and be available to answer any questions. We have worked closely with the public defenders and district attorneys recently and hope that the alterations address their concerns. We sincerely appreciate their suggestions and willingness to work with us to improve the statute which will ultimately lead to better treatment for Nevadans.

Assembly Bill 550 suggests changes to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 178.461 which allows for up to a 10-year commitment at a secure forensic facility for individuals who have been found incompetent with no substantial probability of becoming competent in the foreseeable future for any Category A and certain Category B felonies.

The first section of changes improves the wording to provide clarity on the intent regarding an individual receiving restorative treatment prior to being found permanently incompetent to proceed.

The second change alters the process by which the district attorney notifies the court and DHHS's Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the intent to see a comprehensive risk assessment. The court then writes an order for the division to complete this.

The next alteration reverts back to the original language. It was agreed by all parties that this best captures the process by which someone is committed to the division if the risk assessment determines the person does not need inpatient forensic care.

Finally, for individuals committed under this statute who are placed on conditional release and eligible for discharge from conditional release if it is granted, a slight word change was made from "facility" to "state." This was done to encompass Nevada, as the current language could be interpreted to mean the facility itself, which for individuals on conditional release, might not be a state facility.

We are hopeful that these changes address the concerns expressed by our stakeholders. Passing A.B. 550 will lead to better treatment for individuals, improve efficiency of the risk assessment process and lead to consistency across the State. We anticipate a small fiscal savings of around $5,000 and would like to thank you for this opportunity.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I know that there were some other changes in here. There is no fiscal note at this point. Is that correct?

MR. CROSS:
Correct.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
Can you describe again why this is necessary for implementation at this point?

MR. CROSS:
I would be happy to describe the situations that led to this. Oftentimes, individuals are found incompetent without probability at the NRS 178.415 precommitment level. At that point, the State is required to produce a risk assessment. Now this individual has not received the benefit of restorative treatment where medications and a safe milieu are provided, and we're not measuring from that person's best state. This would assure that individuals would have the opportunity for restoration and the benefits of treatment. Now, while everyone won't be found competent, if a risk assessment is done, they will certainly show better if treatment had been rendered.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
That brings me to my question. Do you anticipate there would be less people that would be diagnosed with this “incompetent without probability” under these circumstances?

MR. CROSS:
A small percentage, yes. I think our precommitment evaluators do a wonderful job. However, the opportunity for restoration can elicit sometimes unexpected results, including an individual being restored to competency.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I think that answers my questions.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Thank you very much for clarifying the fiscal note, and we will now go to those in support. Seeing no one wishing to testify in support, opposition or neutral, Senator Titus has a question.

SENATOR TITUS:
Sorry, I was so interested in the conversation Senator Nguyen was having on that process that I forgot to address my medical debt question. In section 2, subsection 3, it says that when a person is then discharged, they are not liable for any debts, contractual obligations, medical or otherwise, incurred at that time. Is that different than the bill that passed out about absolving somebody from medical debt? Is this because they are not officially arrested and they're not in prison? Is that what separates this out?

MR. CROSS:
Yes, that would be the correct interpretation.

SENATOR NGUYEN:
I was just so confused because this was obviously something I am very familiar with in the criminal world, and also because it's being brought on behalf of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. This is tied to that other Decision Unit 275 in one of the budget accounts, I think 3645, so if we don't enact this law, you will incur those expenses associated with this.

HUMAN SERVICES

DIVISION OF PUBLIC AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH

DHS – DPBH — LAKES CROSSING CENTER — Budget Page DHS - DPBH - 184
Budget Account 101—3645
E-275 Public Safety & Infrastructure – Page DHS-DPBH - 188

MR. CROSS:
Correct. Specifically, when it refers to professional services, this is an annual report that is required for every long-term commitment. We anticipate some individuals being found competent. We will no longer be required to produce that report, so there will be a small fiscal.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Seeing no more questions, I will close the hearing on A.B. 550. What we are going to do next is a BDR [bill draft request] introduction, if you can believe it.

MR. THORLEY:
There's one bill draft request which requires committee introduction today. It is BDR S-1254 which makes appropriations for the implementation of certain collective bargaining agreements.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-1254: Makes appropriations for the implementation of certain additional collective bargaining agreements. (Later introduced as Senate Bill 508).

Just yesterday, the State Board of Examiners approved two collective bargaining agreements with two bargaining units. Under state law, any agreement which requires an act of the Legislature to be given effect, the Governor shall request a BDR to effectuate those provisions, and that is what this BDR is.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
Any questions? I will accept a motion to move to introduce the BDR.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR S-1254.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will move on to the work session that is here on the agenda. Ms. Crocket, will you start with A.B. 102?

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

CATHY CROCKET (Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst):
Assembly Bill 102 was heard in committee on May 29. It authorizes the district board of health and health district that includes a county with a population between 100,000 and 700,000 to regulate emergency medical services within its jurisdictions in the same manner as a county whose population is 700,000 or more.

The bill was presented by the Nevada Fire Chiefs Association and the Reno City Fire Chief. There was a minor potential revenue reduction regarding the fiscal impact for the DHHS's Division of Public and Behavioral Health. However, it is unclear what the magnitude of that may actually be if this is implemented.

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

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 102.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
All right, we will go to Assembly Bill 117.

MS. CROCKET:
Assembly Bill 117 was heard this morning. It requires the DMV to design, issue and prepare a special license plate for the Las Vegas Aces basketball team. The bill was presented by Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May regarding the fiscal impact.

The DMV indicated that they would be able to absorb any costs associated with the implementation of this measure. There were no comments in support or opposition. The DMV was neutral. No amendments were presented and 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. 117.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
All right, Assembly Bill 213, right on time.

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

MR. THORLEY:
Assembly Bill 213 was heard in this committee yesterday, and it revises provisions governing Public Works projects. The bill as amended provides that workers who perform custom fabrication on a public work or for certain government performance contracts must be paid prevailing wage, among other provisions of the bill. The bill was presented by Alfonso Lopez with the Sheet Metal and Air Rail Transportation Workers.

Testimony in support was from Building and Construction Trades Council of Northern Nevada and the Nevada State AFL-CIO. Opposition testimony came from the Nevada Chapter of Associated General Contractors, Associated Builders and Contractors Nevada, Nevada Urban Consortium, National Electrical Contractors Association, Nevada Policy Research Institute and the Nevada Contractors Association. There was no testimony in neutral. There were no amendments presented or discussed.

The Department of Business and Industry's Office of the Labor Commissioner which would be charged with enforcing the provisions of this law submitted a

fiscal note with an undetermined fiscal impact. Fiscal staff would note that the budget the money committees approved this session for the Office of the Labor Commissioner did not include funding for a four-person public work enforcement team which is made up of some investigator positions and some travel costs to perform additional tasks related to enforcement of public works laws. If the committee wishes to move this bill, the appropriate action would be to do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 213.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
All right, we will go to Assembly Bill 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)

MS. CROCKET:
Assembly Bill 220 was heard in committee on May 29. It authorizes the issuance of identification cards by DHHS to persons experiencing homelessness. The bill was presented by Assemblymember Linda Hunt. The language in the bill is permissive. Therefore, the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, that would potentially administer this program, indicated there was zero cost associated with the bill.

There were a number of comments in support and no comments in opposition. The DMV was neutral. No amendments were presented and discussed. If the committee wishes to approve the bill, the motion would be to do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 220.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
With that, we will go to Assembly Bill 259.

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

MS. CROCKET:
Assembly Bill 259 was heard on May 29. It prohibits individuals and entities in Nevada from paying or seeking reimbursement for prescription drugs at prices exceeding federally established maximum fair price under certain circumstances.

The bill was presented by Assemblymember Venicia Considine. Regarding the fiscal impact, the Public Employees' Benefits Program indicated a cost of approximately $920,000 beginning in FY 2027.

Staff would note that budget account does have a number of reserves established with funding in them, so if this cost increased and materialized, they could seek to move funding out of reserve to support any increased cost.

The DHHS Division of Health Care Financing and Policy indicated the fiscal impact could not be determined. Therefore, staff cannot attach any dollar allocation to the projected changes at this time.

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

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 259.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go to Assembly Bill 336.

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

MS. CROCKET:
Assembly Bill 336 makes certain changes to preferences applied to state purchasing contracts to allow certain bidding preferences to stack. The bill was presented by Homa Sayyar who is currently the Deputy Director of the Department of Indigent Defense Services. She recently served in the Department of Administration, Purchasing Division. There is no apparent fiscal impact. There were no comments in opposition, support and 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. 336.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
We will go back to Ms. Crocket again with Assembly Bill 575.

MS. CROCKET:
Assembly Bill 575 was heard in committee this morning. It makes appropriations of $9.1 million from the General Fund and approximately $344,000 from the Highway Fund to the DPS for the replacement of computer hardware and software, furniture and vehicles, as well as information technology projects.

The bill was presented by representatives of the Department of Public Safety. There were no comments in support, opposition or neutral, and no amendments were presented. If the committee wishes to move the bill, the motion would be to do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 575.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
With that, we'll do Assembly Bill 594.

MR. THORLEY:
Assembly Bill 594 revises provisions governing the Department of Taxation. The bill as amended authorizes the department to deliver notices, decisions and other written documents by electronic means under certain circumstances. The bill also revises certain industry classification or the classification of businesses for the purposes of the Commerce Tax and changes the due date for the payment of Sales and Use Taxes.

This is a budget implementation bill that was submitted in order to implement the budget as approved by the money committees. According to that, there's no direct fiscal impact or any fiscal impact as was addressed in the budget.

Testimony in support came from the Nevada Taxpayers Association. There's no testimony in opposition or neutral. There were no amendments presented or discussed. If the committee wishes to move this bill, the appropriate action would be to do pass.

SENATOR NGUYEN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 594.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:
All right, we have completed our work session and our bills for the day, and we will go to public comment. Seeing none, we are adjourned at 9:32 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. 108	C	23	Christi Cabrera-Georgeson / Nevada Conservation League	2024 NOER Grant Awards
A.B. 108	D	23	Christi Cabrera-Georgeson / Nevada Conservation League	2024 NOER Impact Report
A.B. 108	E	23	Christi Cabrera-Georgeson / Nevada Conservation League	2025 NOER Grant Awards