MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

Eighty-third Session
March 19, 2025

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 3:34 p.m. on Wednesday, March 19, 2025, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit A is the agenda. Exhibit B is the attendance roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Edgar Flores, Chair
Senator James Ohrenschall, Vice Chair
Senator Skip Daly
Senator Lisa Krasner
Senator John Ellison
Senator Lori Rogich

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Dina Neal (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator John C. Steinbeck, Senatorial District No. 18
Senator Angela D. Taylor, Senatorial District No. 15

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst
Heidi Chlarson, Committee Counsel
Diane Rea, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Rich Hoggan, Chief Financial Officer, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Ashanti Gray, Assistant Fire Chief and Director, Combined Communications Center, Las Vegas Fire and Rescue

Brian O'Neal
Troyce Krumme, Chairman, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association
Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County
Cayci Froidevaux, Public Safety Dispatch Supervisor, City of Reno
John Abel, Las Vegas Police Protective Association
Ryan Beaman, Professional Firefighters of Nevada
Nicole Rourke, City of Henderson
Wesley Harper, City of North Las Vegas
Al Rojas
Fiona Perreault, Intern to Senator Taylor
Ruth Ann Wright
Sarah Adler, Vitality Unlimited
Sabrina Schnur, Nevada Primary Care Association; Nevada Public Health Association
Kanani Espinoza, Nevada State University
Bobby Ernaut, American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy
Kira Kramer
Edward Delgado
Doug Unger, Nevada Faculty Alliance
Sheila Bray, School of Public Health, University of Nevada, Reno,
Aidan Casey, Intern, Department of Government Affairs, University of Nevada, Reno
Berry Johnston
Dan Coe, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Managers and Supervisors Association
Rick McCann, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition
Jason Lesher, Washoe County Sheriff Deputies Association
Joshua Martinez, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Jamie Frost, Labor Relations Counsel, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Unidentified Caller

CHAIR FLORES:
I would like to open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 208.

SENATE BILL 208: Revises provisions governing certain surcharges imposed by a county. (BDR 20-677)

SENATOR JOHN C. STEINBECK (Senatorial District No. 18):
Senate Bill 208 addresses the use of revenue collected from telephone surcharges. With me today to present S.B. 208 is Rich Hoggan who is joining in Las Vegas. Mr. Hoggan is the Chief Financial Officer for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.

Under existing federal law, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulates the use of funds collected from surcharges for emergency 911 services to prevent their diversion. These funds are primarily used to support and implement emergency services and manage public safety answering points, which is commonly known as 911 dispatch in Nevada. Counties have been authorized to impose surcharges for enhancing emergency telephone systems and purchasing recording devices for law enforcement.

However, the current framework requires updates to align with evolving needs and regulatory requirements. For that purpose, S.B. 208 expands the permissible use of surcharge revenue to include costs associated with construction or upgrading facilities for emergency telephone systems. This is an allowable use by Title 47 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* and has been reportedly adopted in over 40 states. Senate Bill 208 also increases the maximum fund balance to $15 million in counties over 700,000 in population.

There are two proposed amendments. After discussions with various stakeholders, I would like for you to consider these amendments which should also be available on NELIS, and I will briefly touch on them before handing this over to Mr. Hoggan for additional remarks.

The first conceptual amendment (Exhibit C) puts back all the language that was removed in the bill with reference to 911 surcharge used for body cameras. The original language was an effort to improve Nevada's compliance with federal regulations. However, the language was reinstated into the bill due to original NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] statute because of the possible shortfall of local government budgets and our desire to not adversely affect them.

The second one [proposed amendment] (Exhibit D) increases the amount counties can collect that are between 100,000 and 700,000 in population. Through a friendly amendment with Washoe County, Exhibit D, the bill would raise the threshold in these counties, currently Washoe County, to $7.5 million.

This bill does not raise the surcharge fees that are charged our citizens as that is all controlled by the county level.

RICH HOGGAN (Chief Financial Officer, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):
The two changes, particularly the changes as they relate to the allowability of the funds for construction, will be very beneficial to Southern Nevada in particular. One of the benefits, as you may have heard—there's been some press on this topic as well—we are looking to construct a joint communication center. Those funds would potentially, with this change, allow us to use some revenue to offset the cost of constructing that facility, probably not entirely but at least in part. Then just some sort of conforming pieces of that is the amount of carryover increasing from $5 million to $15 million as just sort of a practical matter. It is very hard when you are engaging in a large construction project or even just the recurring expenses that we have in Clark County related to our 911 system. It is very difficult to operate with a $5 million fund balance. It sort of made sense early on when this statute was put in place, but times have changed and we just need a little bit more latitude to be able to build up a fund balance sufficient for some of those one-time expenditures we anticipate happening in the future.

SENATOR KRASNER:
I am looking at section 2, subsection 2, where it says that some of the money from 911 can be used for the purpose of purchasing and maintaining portable event recording devices like the body cams that our law enforcement officers wear. You are saying that it is crossed out now, but you are adding it back in. Is that correct?

SENATOR STEINBECK:
That is correct. Everything that has been crossed out with reference to portable event recording devices, which was part of this original bill, has been eliminated. So that part of the statute will not be touched.

SENATOR KRASNER:
It is a little bit confusing because you have it crossed out, but now you are putting it back in. So that would mean that money from 911 would not be able to be used for the body cams.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
No, money from 911 surcharges would not change at this point in time in any way other than to be available to be used for facilities. However, the use of those funds for body cameras, like Washoe County is currently doing, will not change. The original bill crossed out the use of those funds for body cameras. The amendment put that language back in.

SENATOR KRASNER:
So the money can be used for the law enforcement body cams.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
That is correct. I know that it is confusing to say we are putting back in the language that we took out, but that is really what we are doing and that is what the conceptual amendment that legal put together, as well, states.

CHAIR FLORES:
We will get clarification from our legal counsel.

HEIDI CHLARSON (Committee Counsel):
Just to clarify, the bill, as introduced, did propose to remove authority to use these fees for body cameras. What the conceptual amendment, Exhibit C, proposes is to eliminate those sections from the bill. Therefore, those sections, if this amendment is adopted by the committee, those sections will be deleted. Those sections will not be repealed from the law, they will just be deleted so that this bill, moving forward, does not affect those sections.

SENATOR DALY:
I got the part on the amendment and on what happened with that. The question was on the use for construction funds, and I am fine with that. Is it for all counties or just Washoe and Clark? I know that was a little bit confusing going back. I know you want to raise it to, I believe, $15 million for Clark County. And then I saw the Washoe County amendment for $7.5 million. Does it apply to all of the counties or just the two large counties that can use that for construction?

SENATOR STEINBECK:
Any county that enacts the 911 surcharge would have the ability to use them for the facility use. The only thing that is different between the different counties, by population, is the amount that they can hold before having to

return funds back. So the county is under 100,000, as written, and I will ask legal to confirm this as well, but the counties that are under 100,000 would remain still at that $5 million threshold.

SENATOR DALY:
I just wanted to be clear on that. I thought I saw that, and I saw the amendment and I was just making sure that the level's based on the population.

SENATOR ELLISON:
I think it is important for the body cam, but I do have a question. This is an enabling bill that the county's got to implement, or is it mandatory? That is my first question.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
This is only if a county enacts the surcharge and collects it. This allows them to be able to utilize the funds for those purposes set aside in NRS. This has nothing to do with a county having to enact the 911 surcharge. And it does not direct the county as to how they have to use those funds other than within the parameters that are stipulated in the law already. With this adjustment, it adds a little bit of latitude for the counties to be able to decide how to use their 911 surcharge funds and does not mandate anything.

SENATOR ELLISON:
They put the 911 surcharge in years ago. I mean, we are involved with that, but that money was to be used for body cams because they had to make some changes to actually use that for the body cams because the money was used for maintenance and to upgrade the 911 system. Is this bill going to change any of that at all? I do not see that.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
No, the original language would have changed that, and that was to put us in compliance with federal regulations. Nevada is and will remain on the diversion list with the FCC because we utilize that money for body cameras. However, with the amendments that have been changed, that will not change the ability for any of the local governments to utilize that money for body cameras.

ASHANTI GRAY (Assistant Fire Chief and Director, Combined Communications Center, Las Vegas Fire and Rescue):
I am here today in strong support of this critical legislation. The Combined Communications Center (CCC) is the second-busiest 911 center in Southern Nevada, providing emergency call-taking and dispatch services for Las Vegas, Clark County and North Las Vegas Fire Departments.

In 2024 alone, we handled over 600,000 calls. That's approximately 1,685 calls per day or 70 calls every hour, continuous stream of emergencies. This resulted in over 13,000 fire responses, over 300,000 EMS [Emergency Medical Service] responses, over 18,000 other emergency responses and 29 hazardous incident responses. By allowing the 911 surcharge to fund Next Generation 911 technology, we can locate callers more accurately, reducing response times because in a cardiac arrest, a fire or an active shooter situation, seconds mean the difference between life and death. It also permits the use of funds for facility upgrades and new construction.

The CCC, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and the City of North Las Vegas are colocating at a new shared facility. This will improve real-time coordination between law enforcement, fire and EMS; enhance disaster resilience with backup capabilities; and reduce construction costs through shared infrastructure. Colocating emergency communications ensures that during major incidents, first responders receive the same critical information at the same time. This eliminates delays, streamlines decision-making and saves more lives.

This legislation is an investment in public safety. It modernizes our technology, strengthens coordination and protects our community. I urge your support. I have submitted my written letter of support (Exhibit E).

BRIAN O'NEAL:
I am speaking in support of S.B. 208. Technology improvements to enable Next Generation 911 and public safety answering points will enable responders to arrive to the right calls with the right resources faster than we ever have. It is important to have flexibility in spending the 911 surcharge funds in a way that allows the right technology to be tested, trialed and implemented in a deliberate way without rushing due to physical timelines. Allowing more funds to carry over year to year will allow greater flexibility and acknowledge the pace of

change with the technology improvements to ensure effective changes are being made that will improve public safety.

TROYCE KRUMME (Chairman, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association):
The Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association represents the sergeants, lieutenants and captains with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.

We are here in support of S.B. 208. Simply put, these funds are going to be used to upgrade 911 systems. When our community members pick up the phone and dial 911, they expect to be able to have a good connection, a fast-answering service and that the help will be shortly upon the way. These funds will go a long way to ensuring that our first responders have the ability to protect our community members.

CADENCE MATIJEVICH (Washoe County):
As Senator Steinbeck mentioned when he presented the bill, Washoe County is in support of the bill, but we are coming forward with an amendment, Exhibit D, today. That amendment is to section 3 beginning on page 8 of the bill. It is subsection 7 of section 3 that is to amend the population cap that currently applies. You see that in subsection 6, the new population cap has been added for Clark County. This adjusts the population cap for Washoe County to clarify that our ending fund balance amount allowable can be raised to $7.5 million, from the current $5 million, for the same reasons that you heard earlier.

We appreciate that the Senator is bringing specificity to this law that we can use this for construction of new facilities or improvements to existing facilities. As you heard, we may need to accumulate funding to take on those projects. Additionally, this also recognizes that the buying power of $5 million, when this was put into place, is not the same as it used to be. We appreciate that. Additionally, I want to give my thanks to Senator Steinbeck for understanding that the original version of the bill would have had a significant fiscal impact on some of the local governments in the State and we appreciate him bringing the amendment forward.

CAYCI FROIDEVAUX (Public Safety Dispatch Supervisor, City of Reno):
As a public safety dispatch supervisor, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of S.B. 208. It is critical to enhancing our state's emergency response capabilities. The 911 professionals are the first responders. Every second matters in an emergency. This bill provides support to ensure that we have the resources, training and infrastructure necessary to provide the highest level of service to Nevadans. Whether it is funding for technology upgrades or operational support, S.B. 208, along with the proposed amendment to section 3, subsection 7 on page 8, strengthens the foundation of our emergency communication system and provides expanded tools that can support 911 centers. This bill addresses the population growth in our State and helps support funding in counties in a more proportionate manner. I urge the committee to support this bill for the safety of our communities and the well-being of those who answer the call when Nevadans need it most.

JOHN ABEL (Las Vegas Police Protective Association):
I am the Government Affairs Director of the LVPPA [Las Vegas Police Protective Association]. Dispatching and call-taking are a cornerstone of policing. Without them, we could not adequately keep our community safe in Nevada. For that reason, we support this bill.

RYAN BEAMAN (Professional Firefighters of Nevada):
I am here today to express my strong support for S.B. 208 as a critical piece of legislation that directly impacts the safety and efficiency of emergency response systems in Nevada. As a firefighter, I have witnessed firsthand the importance of a reliable and well-funded emergency communication system.

Senate Bill 208 proposes revisions to use the revenue collected from the county imposed by a telephone surcharge to ensure that these funds are allocated and the essential upgrades take place. As firefighters, we rely on a seamless coordination of emergency service to do our job effectively. Senate Bill 208 strengthens this coordination by investing in the backbone of our emergency response system. It’s an investment in the public safety and the well-being of our citizens and the future of our State. I urge you to support S.B. 208.

NICOLE ROURKE (City of Henderson):
I want to echo the comments of support from my municipal colleagues and also thank the sponsor of the bill for bringing this forward. We look forward to the

opportunity of this additional financial support for our 911 system and to better serve the residents of this city.

WESLEY HARPER (City of North Las Vegas):
As Director of Government Affairs for the City of North Las Vegas, I certainly echo the sentiments of the supporters of this bill. We appreciate Senator Steinbeck for bringing it forward. It strengthens public safety. Therefore, we are in support.

AL ROJAS:
I am from Assembly District 12 and Senate District 21. First of all, not only am I in support of this bill, but I am also so glad to see so many elected people who are involved in our security who are concerned about our security. Unfortunately, I just gave a testimony at one of our commissioners' meetings, and I made a comment that our security was not taken as seriously as I felt it should have been. I am really glad to hear that all of these elected people who are testifying really do care about our security. I want to thank them. I am in total support of this bill. I thank our Legislators and everybody who testified in support.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
I would just like to close by saying, we really appreciate your consideration of this. As you can tell from the people who are here in support, this is a needed item to improve a critical piece of emergency services. Our 911 dispatchers are the unsung heroes in the emergency providers. We do not always understand how much we rely on them, but firefighters, emergency medical, police officers go through hundreds, even thousands, of hours of training.

We put a tremendous amount into those resources, and they go unused improperly if you do not get the right call and get the person out at the right time with the right information. Much of our infrastructure throughout the State is antiquated, both the facilities and the equipment. We need to make these upgrades and really appreciate your consideration on this bill so that counties and local jurisdictions can move forward.

CHAIR FLORES:
We will close the hearing on Senate Bill 208 and open the hearing on Senate Bill 266.

SENATE BILL 266: Revises provisions governing the Student Loan Repayment for Providers of Health Care in Underserved Communities Program. (BDR 18-1064)

SENATOR ANGELA D. TAYLOR (Senatorial District No. 15):
I have a presentation (Exhibit E) today, and we will have everyone introduce themselves. I have some great folks here helping me because that is the best way to do it. Let me give you just a little bit of background. Senate Bill 266 revises provisions governing the Student Loan Repayment for Providers of Health Care in Underserved Communities Program. You can see it is a very short bill. So let me talk just a little bit about it.

The Office of the State Treasurer administers the program that started just last session through A.B. No. 45 of the 82nd Session.

The objective is to incentivize healthcare professionals to practice in areas where services are most needed—underserved communities. The program enhances healthcare access and equity in underserved areas of the State and improves our overall healthcare workforce. With your permission, our intern would walk us through the bill.

FIONA PERREAULT (Intern to Senator Taylor):
Section 1 of this bill already included physicians, physician assistants, dentists, nurses, certified EMS staff and paramedics, optometrists, audiologists, respiratory care practitioners, podiatrists, psychologists, clinical professional counselors, perfusionists, pharmacists and pharmacy technicians. Additionally, it also already included midwives and doula service providers. Senate Bill 266 will introduce marriage and family therapists, and clinical licensed and certified alcohol and drug counselors.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
Basically, this is adding an area that we left off, quite frankly, last year, and we are really wanting to incentivize people in underserved areas and much-needed professions to be in those areas to help our Nevadans where they are needed most.

To talk about that and why it is important, we have someone who walks in both of those areas as a marriage and family therapist as well as a substance abuse counselor.

RUTH ANN WRIGHT:
I testify today in favor of these revisions to S.B. 266. I am here as a licensed alcohol and drug counselor, that is an LADC. I am also a licensed marriage and family therapist, an MFT, and I am a licensed psychologist. I have held these first two licenses since 1988, but I am a relative newcomer to psychology. I have only been licensed since 2009.

I go into such detail to point out that I am an MFT and an LADC who's been licensed for 37 years. These two professions that have been left off the list of providers have a long history in Nevada. They've been regulated since the 1970s. Marriage and family therapists were first regulated and recognized in 1973 and drug and alcohol counselors in 1975. These professions were licensed before clinical social workers, who were licensed in 1999, well before clinical professional counselors who were licensed in 2007.

As a licensed practitioner of the mental health healing arts, I know that MFTs, LCADCs [licensed clinical alcohol and drug abuse counselor], LCSWs [licensed clinical social worker] and clinical psychologists all provide similar services, albeit they come from very different theoretical orientations and offer a different kind of therapy. I think that the wider the type of professional that is available, the better Nevadans are served.

I want to talk to the fact that I have recently closed my clinical practice. At this point in my career, my primary focus is supervising interns, CPCs [clinical professional counselor] and MFTs particularly. I have been privy to an incredible amount of information, yet my interns have incurred in their desire to become licensed MFTs and CPCs to provide therapy and counseling to Nevadans in need. I value and have supervised interns from diverse backgrounds and populations. I have done tele … [unintelligible statement] … within … [unintelligible statement] … I have supervised interns who speak Spanish as their first language. I now have former interns who are now licensed professionals currently working with rural populations in various local high schools and private behavioral mental health agencies and state-funded programs, nonprofit organizations and in private practice. I know full well how beneficial to both underserved populations and also struggling interns this revision will be.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
If I may just offer a summation. Senate Bill 266 just expands the definition of provider of health care in the pertinent statute to include marriage and family therapist, clinical alcohol and drug counselor, and a licensed certified alcohol and drug counselor. This small change will let these professionals participate in the program. It is just to correct a wrong, an oversight from last session.

I know this is a policy committee and not a fiscal committee, but just so you know, I want to mention that the State Treasurer's fiscal note indicated zero fiscal impact for this bill.

SENATOR ELLISON:
When I read the bill, it said "relating to health care; authorizing certain providers of behavioral health services to participate in the Student Loan Repayment ... ." In other words, is this like if there's a charge from somewhere, does that go under their student loan or is it ... ? I was kind of confused about that. And then the other question I got is, does not Medicaid pick up part of this?

SENATOR TAYLOR:
Medicaid does not provide this service. This is a payment to the professional. Medicaid pays for the service the patient qualifies and is a part of Medicaid. This is something very different. This is a student loan reimbursement for people who have gone through these programs. Go back to the whole list because it is a pretty comprehensive list—there are two slides to it. But we get the gist. And because we really need these services in those underserved communities, and the way the program exists now is in the State Treasurer's Office. This is a program that was established in the State Treasurer's Office last session. There's an amount of money, a pool and people apply for the pool and then those who are awarded it are based upon the need, the area and the profession that they represent. There is much more demand for this than we currently fund right now, but what this does is just says we need these mental health professionals in our communities, especially in underserved communities. This is something we can do to help entice them to stay once they graduate and then to serve those communities that need it most.

SENATOR KRASNER:
For those people who do not know exactly what the program does, could you just kind of spell it out step by step, this student loan reimbursement program?

How long do they have to practice in the underserved area? Just a little background, please?

SENATOR TAYLOR:
The way the program works is students don't apply. Once you are professional, you can apply to be considered for this loan repayment program, and part of your being able to receive the loan repayment for that year is serving in an underserved community for that year. It is not like we are paying for their entire career as a professional. Then we'd say how many years are we going to get from you in Elko, in Ely, in this low-income neighborhood or on one of the tribal communities or something like that. If you apply each year, you have to apply again.

SENATOR ROGICH:
My question is with regard to who is the applicant? Are these individuals that have graduated from a university or college in Nevada, or are they coming from out of state and seeking reimbursement in order to work in that particular field?

SENATOR TAYLOR:
That is the line I do not remember. But if I have to look it up and tell you for sure, my understanding of its, though as I remember it now, because it was two years ago when we passed this thing—is that these are for graduates from our universities here, our colleges and universities here in Nevada. But I will get that and make sure I get it to the committee.

MS. CHLARSON:
To be eligible, a person does have to be a resident of Nevada. They have to be a current resident. They have to be actively licensed, certified or registered in good standing to practice in the State as a provider of health care. They already have to have their license, and they have to commit to at least five years of clinical practice in an underserved area. That would include any rural county, on tribal lands and in certain communities that have been designated by a census tract as sort of a qualified census tract or have a high level of social vulnerability as determined by the CDC [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention]. They already have to be a resident of the State. I do not see a requirement that they have to have gone to school here, though.

SENATOR DALY:
I understand the bill is a good catch in addition to an existing funded program, at least to the levels that people just have to apply.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
I did not remember the five-year part. Thank you for that clarification. I knew they were for people in our State to help us meet a need that we have. The fund is not enough for all that we need but, certainly, for those who we can get, let us keep and hold on to.

MS. WRIGHT:
Many of our professionals are the interns that I work with, who live and reside in Nevada and attend colleges online. They might not be going to like UNR [University of Nevada, Reno] or UNLV [University of Nevada, Las Vegas], but they are living in Nevada while they go to college, and that costs money too.

SENATOR TAYLOR:
They have to be licensed in order to apply for this and so on. They may be taking other settings, but they have to have their license in order to qualify for the program.

SARAH ADLER (Vitality Unlimited):
I represent Vitality Unlimited, which is a rural healthcare provider of ASAM [American Society of Addiction Medicine] 3.5 level residential treatment, substance use disorder treatment services as well as operator of certified community behavioral health centers in Elko, Dayton and Carson City.

The sponsor may not know this, but this is a licensed alcohol and drug counselor equity bill, and it is a continuation, in my mind, of how in 2021, Senator Pete Goicoechea—your predecessor, sir—carried S.B. No. 181 of the 81st Session because at that time, you had to have 1,000 more supervised intern hours to get your LADC license versus your licensed clinical social worker license.

And this was a real detriment to encouraging people to become licensed alcohol and drug counselors, which of course we have a desperate need for in our State, particularly in these underserved areas. The folks who are receiving services are largely Medicaid-eligible folks. Vitality Unlimited, a manager of these services, is not able to pay a market wage that allows you to repay your

loans very easily. Last session, I sought to get LADCs included in this loan repayment program and was not successful. But I am absolutely thrilled to see them included in this bill, and we encourage your strong support of S.B. 266.

SABRINA SCHNUR (Nevada Primary Care Association; Nevada Public Health Association):
We are just here to offer a ditto today to all of the comments.

KANANI ESPINOZA (Nevada State University):
Although Nevada State University does not currently offer master's programs in counseling, we are committed to accelerating the pipeline of qualified counselors. Many of our students complete an 18-credit course in counseling minor with a specialization in addiction treatment. This minor significantly reduces the required supervised work hours to become a certified alcohol and drug counselor by over 50 percent, equating to more than 1,500 hours. Consequently, many of our students become credentialed and pursue a master's degree. Given the critical nature of these positions, especially in underserved areas, graduates who dedicate themselves to this work would greatly benefit from the student loan forgiveness provided by this bill. In addition, I would like to provide support on behalf of UNLV. There is a very similar bill in the Assembly that we are able to copresent, and we appreciate all eyes on this bill.

BOBBY ERNAUT (American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy):
Our members are thrilled at the opportunity to utilize this great program, and we just want to thank the sponsor for bringing the bill forward.

MS. MATIJEVICH:
Increasing access to behavioral health services is a priority for Washoe County. As some members of this committee may know, Washoe County, with assistance from the State, has purchased a behavioral health hospital and is in the process of reinventing that to have it reopened in our community.

The workforce for that is foundational to the access to these services. We are grateful to Senator Taylor for bringing this bill forward to help recruit and retain this critical resource for our community.

KIRA KRAMER:
I am a public health student and UNLV honors student. I am here today to express my strong support for this bill that will expand Student Loan Repayment

for Providers of Health Care in Underserved Communities and to include behavioral health providers such as marriage and family therapists and alcohol and drug counselors. As a public health student, I understand the critical need for mental health and substance use disorder services in our community. These communities often face significant barriers to accessing care, including a shortage of trained professionals. By expanding the scope of this program, we are not only helping individuals who have dedicated their careers to helping others, but also ensuring that those in need of behavioral health services can access them more easily. This bill directly addresses the shortage of behavioral health providers in underserved communities by incentivizing professionals to work where they are most needed. The burden of student loan debt is a significant barrier to entering and staying in these communities. Offering loan repayment assistance is an effective strategy to attract and retain qualified providers. By supporting these professionals, we are investing in the well-being of our Nevada communities.

In my own personal life, I would like to share that the support of marriage and family counselors and therapists has helped me be a successful student at UNLV by helping me navigate family dynamics, as I have a family with members who have disabilities and special needs. Their services are key and instrumental to helping me be successful as a student. It is a struggle to find providers covered by our insurance, and increasing access to providers is necessary for Nevadans. In conclusion, this bill is an important step forward to expanding access to much-needed behavioral health services in underserved areas. I strongly encourage you all to support it.

EDWARD DELGADO:
I am a second-year political science and history major with the Honors College, and I would like to state for the record that I am speaking on my own accord. I am in support of S.B. 266. The American Association of Medical Colleges ranks Nevada among the lowest, and I repeat the lowest, in primary care physicians. Of course, the root issue is funding. Undergraduates spend endless amounts of hours studying and thousands of dollars for their bachelor's degree, all to take out loans to progress their journey to become marriage and family therapists and substance abuse counselors.

As a legal aid intern, I have seen countless individuals seeking a divorce at the family court self-help center and countless evidence exhibits where substance abuse is involved in marriage and custody cases. Including aspiring family

therapists and substance abuse counselors to the student loan repayment for providers of health care in the underserved communities program will increase the amount of clinical and licensed workers in these respective fields, decrease the amount of divorces filed in the Nevada and will address the drug issues and concerns in both northern and southern Nevada.

DOUG UNGER (Nevada Faculty Alliance):
I am a member of UNLV Employee Benefits Advisory Committee. Nevada faces a medical provider shortage which is well documented. This is especially so for behavioral health providers, including skilled drug abuse and alcoholism counselors and family therapists for underserved communities.

Studies show nationally that students who complete degrees in a state tend to remain in practice in that state at an approximate rate of 62 percent. Senate Bill 266 provides an additional incentive for those students who learn skills and become certified in these crucial behavioral healthcare fields or those who move to Nevada from out of state to remain in practice in our State and serve our citizens most in need—especially during these most uncertain times when federal support is at risk. Our State stepping forward to assist with student loan repayment for healthcare fields vital to the well-being of our State more than makes sense. It will help fill the healthcare needs of our community. The Nevada Faculty Alliance stands in support of S.B. 266.

SHEILA BRAY (School of Public Health, University of Nevada, Reno):
I am calling in full support of S.B. 266. Within the University of Nevada, Reno, and our School of Public Health we have the only program in the State that focuses on clinical alcohol and drug counseling as well as an alcohol and drug counseling license program.

We are in full support of this as it provides more help for our behavioral pipeline so desperately needed within the State. And as previously mentioned, there is a similar bill in the Assembly, Assembly Bill 269, that has an amendment that looks to also expand to public health professionals in the State. And we are also in support of that.

ASSEMBLY BILL 269: Revises provisions relating to education. (BDR 18-618)

MR. ROJAS:
I want to thank Senator Taylor for making, addressing or creating this bill. Mental health is a serious issue. Our sheriff down here, Kevin McMahill, had the [LVMPD] Wellness Bureau developed to do for mental health for our officers, and it has been very successful. She may want to look into how they are doing it to help, but it has been very helpful for our sheriff.

We have a big problem here with domestic violence and the homeless. We are trying to work on that. As a member of many successful neighborhood watch groups, we are seeing that mental health is a big issue. I want to thank Senator Taylor. I believe she has a Ph.D., but she has not forgotten about our inner cities. She cares about us, and I am totally in support of this bill.

AIDAN CASEY (Intern, Department of Government Affairs, University of Nevada, Reno):
I serve as an intern for the Department of Government Affairs for the Associated Students at UNR. Since 1898, the Associated Students at the University of Nevada has represented the undergraduate student body at UNR. Today, I am here to express our strong support for S.B. 266, and further expanding student loan repayment for providers of health care in underserved communities.

According to the 2023 ASU [Arizona State University] issues and priorities need assessment, 74 percent of students identified financial concerns as the number one issue. Many of these students come from Asian, Black, Indigenous, Latinx, Pacific Islander and multiethnic backgrounds. Second to financial issues, career development remains the second most pressing issue for undergraduate students. As demonstrated, using this data is evident that students need aid in relieving the financial burden that accumulates when going through systems of higher education. Senate Bill 266 addresses the critical issues students are facing and provides vital solutions by expanding the definition of provider of health care to now include marriage and family therapist, and clinical or licensed and certified alcohol and drug counselors.

Both of these are supported by undergraduate degrees at the University of Nevada, Reno. Many of our students move on to pursue careers within these fields, really contributing to the betterment of our State. Assistance in student loan repayment would relieve these financial burdens and aid the caregivers in our State.

BERRY JOHNSTON:
The oversight last session was not restoring pay for doctors that Nevada government lowered, causing our health crisis. Someone mentioned the reduction in pay and our sharp decline in medical providers. Now we are in a dangerous trend, destroying our healthcare system, government intervention through socialist policies and repaying school loans. These bureaucrats thought that they could cut doctors' pay, dictate their value and expect them to stay. Well, guess what? It isn't just our family. More than half of our doctors moved, and student doctors of Spring Valley Hospital GME [Graduate Medical Education] program killed my mom because of what you did.

Now instead of fixing their mistake, restoring fair pay for doctors, they want to throw our tax dollars at student loan repayment bribe to young doctors working in an unsustainable system. It is nothing but a band aid of bull. Are you requiring them to repay if they move after five years? These imported students leave, going back to their home countries and states. The real solution, stop punishing success, stop government wage controls, pay doctors what they are worth. You get what you pay for, and right now, we are punishing the best and brightest out of medicine. We do not need more government handouts.

We need a free market where skilled professionals are valued and where patients have a choice of where government is not in the way. If we want doctors to stay, we have to restore their pay, restore their freedom and let the market work. Even with the socialist experiments, we hated this when Biden did it; Nevada needs to restore pay for doctors instead of allowing students to kill people like my mom. It is time to fix the problem with real solutions. Are there any bills restoring pay for doctors or are you guys just going to keep letting them move?

SENATOR TAYLOR:
This is really in conclusion. Senate Bill 266 represents a very small but a very important step toward Nevada's efforts to expand behavioral health in the underserved communities where we need them most. I urge your support of S.B. 266. And I would like to go on the record that I am wearing a red suit.

CHAIR FLORES:
We will close the hearing on Senate Bill 266 and invite our very own Senator Skip Daly to present Senate Bill 298.

SENATE BILL 298: Revises provisions relating to public employment. (BDR 23-1031)

SENATOR SKIP DALY (Senatorial District No. 13):
I was assigned through leadership to work on this bill. We are here to present that, and we have Troyce Krumme here to help copresent if you guys have questions, and we have their legal counsel on Zoom. They can tell you the story and the genesis of the various things behind it. I do have a couple of comments, I would just say them as we go through the bill. The amendment (Exhibit F) is what we want to work off of and, similar to the question we had before, we are deleting section 1 of the bill, the provision of NRS 288.110, that was unchanged by this bill; we still live and will be happy in statute with no changes on that.

In section 2, we are proposing to amend NRS 289.010—which is the Peace Officers Bill of Rights is what it is commonly known as—to add in the provisions what punitive action means, which is the transfer to increase of either seniority or compensation. And then after a little bit of discussion back and forth on where, if it did not go in section 1, we were looking at it and I started asking questions so I could understand it. Where they had it was in the [NRS] 288 provisions for the EMRB [Employee-Management Relations Board] addressing unfair labor practices, et cetera, at the state level.

We both came to the conclusion that it does not belong there. We felt it still belongs in NRS 288 but more in the sections of collective bargaining. So, as you can see in the amendment, we are proposing to add some language to NRS 288.505. That language was provided by Mr. Krumme and his folks.

Just to comment on where they are trying to go on when they do this. I was talking with some of the stakeholders earlier today. I do not think this favors management or labor. I understand management is going to come up in opposition, which is perfectly fine. It is not hard to figure out if I am going to be on the side of labor or management. You know, it is not hard to figure out where I am going to be on that. But when you are looking at this and you are looking at it just from a practical standpoint, there are any number of things, thousands of potential things, that are not specifically covered in a collective bargaining agreement that come up during arbitration, and you say, you know we have the general principle, we have the outline and now a decision has to be

made on this in the particular place and Mr. Krumme can explain a little bit further.

Some people have said, we can just take care of it in collective bargaining, and we can add that thing in. I think the precedent for that is risky on the labor side because if you do that, you continually do that over a period of time; arbitrators, lawyers on the other side, will say, well, if we meant it to be covered in the collective bargaining, you would have put it there, and over time you are always going to be fighting, what is the next issue that we did not think of? And you can have 10,000 words in collective bargaining agreement, not cover every single scenario. I think this general language will be beneficial to both sides in the long run. That's just me having worked in the industry for a little while, is you can't anticipate everything. Just saying it does not favor either way if there's something is not 100 percent or specifically and allow the arbitrator to make a reasoned decision based on the facts of the case rather than saying, oh, it is not in collective bargaining agreement, so I can't rule, or I am going to rule in favor of management or vice versa. This would give that little bit of latitude on that.

With that, I will let Mr. Krumme explain a little bit of the situation that we got to from here, but we think we hit on the right spot where this goes and I think overall this will be more beneficial than harmful and beneficial to both sides.

MR. KRUMME:
Joining me on Zoom is our general counsel, Dan Coe, to assist in answering any legal questions that the committee might have. As a leader of an employee association, one of my main responsibilities is to ensure that my members are enjoying professional and fair treatment from their employer. One of the ways that we accomplish this is through collective bargaining. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 288 allows for certain public employees to collectively bargain with their employers. This process sets the guidelines for the relationship between the employer and the employee. At the core of that relationship is the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) that dictates for both sides what they are, what they are not allowed to do over issues subject to mandatory bargaining. On occasion, the two sides will have a disagreement about whether the CBA was violated. The grievance process is enacted and unless resolved, ultimately lands in an arbitration setting. The arbitrator hears both sides and renders a decision. We believe that we have identified a flaw in the system that this bill aims to correct.

What happens when contract language is silent on a specific topic? Traditional contract interpretation states that the terms should be construed against the drafter of the clause. In contract negotiations, we present changes to one another and do not believe that the bargaining process should be used against either party. This bill would prohibit the fact finder or an arbitrator from drawing an inference that benefits either side. It is an impossibility for either side to think of every possible scenario that may arise and bargain it.

As an additional benefit, this bill would encourage both sides to come to the table and negotiate terms when those times arise where silence or ambiguity are identified, rather than one side taking a chance, their action will prevail in an arbitration.

This bill also changes under NRS 289 to further define punitive action, which would include a denial of an increase in either seniority or compensation, commonly referred to as a step increase or a merit increase, which we believe are necessary.

We had a member who was denied his negotiated standard step increase without due process and without any finding of fault. The department denied his increase because he was under an administrative internal affairs investigation at the time of his anniversary when he was due his step increase.

Once the investigation was later completed, the department then demoted the member. In effect, this member was disciplined three times for the same set of circumstances. He lost pay from not getting his step increase. He lost rank through the demotion—which comes with the loss of prestige because as police officers, we look forward to our promotion—which resulted in additional loss of pay through losing pay in the demotion process.

We believe that this is wrong and excessive. The taking of any part of a person's salary is a major discipline because of the compounding nature of one's salary and the reliance people have on their income. This change to NRS 289 protects all officers from having pay increases denied without due process or losing seniority without due process.

SENATOR ROGICH:
I noticed that there is no effective date for this bill. When will it take effect?

MR. KRUMME:
We would expect it under normal due course, which I believe would be July 1 under NRS, or please correct me.

MS. CHLARSON:
Just to clarify, anytime a bill does not have a specific effective date, it is effective October 1 of the current year.

A lot of bills are either effective on a different date or have a mix of effective dates. But when there's no effective date section, there is a provision of NRS that does say that such a bill would be effective on October 1. So, in this case, it would be October 1, 2025.

CHAIR FLORES:
Just for a point of clarification and looking specifically at NRS 289 in the Bill of Rights and adding the denial of increase or seniority or compensation, et cetera, can you walk me through the hypothetical presently as the law stands before we change it? I understand this would trigger a whole host of due process. But under the current law, if there is a disagreement and an officer is under investigation, and they have their merit pay withheld, and let us say the investigation is ongoing for six months, and if at the conclusion of that investigation, and while the merit pay was being withheld, the officer wins the arbitration, whatever the investigation went on, and turns out he or she was in the right, are they entitled presently for back pay on those six months? Is that happening now?

MR. KRUMME:
I would argue that the law is silent on that, Senator. Typically under standard practice in a situation that you just explained, back pay would be afforded, but that is not protected within the law.

CHAIR FLORES:
Understood. Then maybe for some of the folk coming in opposition, if you have the answer to that question, I am curious to know, please.

SENATOR KRASNER:
So, you deleted section 1; that is no longer in. What would a law enforcement officer be doing, what would he or she be investigated for so this would come up?

MR. KRUMME:
An officer or supervisor can be investigated for any level of alleged misconduct. To narrow it down to what they could be investigated for, that list is long and properly unending of what they could be investigated for.

SENATOR KRASNER:
If a law enforcement officer is being investigated for misconduct, is it typical that if they are found responsible of that misconduct that they might be demoted or they might lose pay?

MR. KRUMME:
It depends on the level of misconduct. We have negotiated what we call a discipline matrix which allows for certain levels of discipline. Either a minor, could be a warning, a written reprimand, a certain level hours of suspension, and then for supervisors, demotion and ultimately termination. It really depends on the severity of the allegation.

SENATOR ELLISON:
Maybe you said this, and I just didn't hear it. What if he is found not guilty? At that point in time does he get his back pay back, plus his promotion back or does it just start all over again?

MR. KRUMME:
That would be up to the arbitrator. The arbitrator could choose to award back pay back to the date of the demotion, or the arbitrator could give the rank back but without back pay. It would be dependent on the decision made.

SENATOR ELLISON:
If I may. It seems to me if you are found not guilty, you are not guilty.

MR. KRUMME:
For the record, I would agree.

SENATOR ELLISON:
If you are not guilty, you are not guilty.

DAN COE (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Managers and Supervisors Association):
I am the general counsel for the PMSA, Police Managers and Supervisors Association. In fact, we do represent all sergeants, lieutenants and captains at

the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD). I think the chair has hit it on the head. I think Senator Daly has hit it on the head. Our concerns with the first rule, is construe against the drafter, is an issue for us. We commonly seek changes with the department, and we do not want those written solutions used against us in the collective bargaining process. The fact that we drafted them should not be used against us. The fact that they've drafted them should not be used against the department. We think this is a mainstay of negotiations and all associations should benefit from this process. It creates certainty in the negotiations process and that is why we brought this bill.

The second part, with regard to punitive actions, one of the Senators had asked, and I think it was clarified with the final question: Do they always get their pay back? And the answer is no, they do not always get their pay back. The fact that they can win and not get it, obviously, is a big issue. The fact that they can have their pay taken, without a finding of wrongdoing, then have a finding of wrongdoing, then have a demotion and then have additional pay taken is one of our biggest issues—that the punishment should fit the crime. And any discipline should be singular and not multiple. I think that is the biggest concern we have. We urge the committee to support Senate Bill 298 and thank you for your consideration.

MR. ABEL:
As Director of Governmental Affairs for the LVPPA, I wholeheartedly support this bill that the PMSA is proposing with Senator Daly. I will also tell you when it comes to the merit increases in pay, while rare, we have had officers at LVMPD who are put on a performance plan for maybe not making enough arrests or maybe not writing enough tickets, and they have been threatened, or they've had their merit increases withheld or put on hold without any due process or any investigation. So for that reason we do support this bill.

RICK MCCANN (Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition):
I will make it brief. It is late in the day. We give a wholehearted me too and a true ditto everything that you have heard here today in support of S.B. 298.

JASON LESHER (Washoe County Sheriff Deputies Association):
That will also be a ditto for me as well.

MR. JOHNSTON:
As a proud supporter of our law enforcement officers, the men and women who put their lives on the line daily to protect our families and our freedoms, many of my friends wear Metro's badge. I have grown up with Metro officers and my friends' dads were officers. I know firsthand the stress of the politics and the change challenges they face not from criminals but from within their own department.

Right now, we have constitutional officers facing retaliation simply for upholding their oath to the people, while some corrupt leadership shields those who violate American values, like a disgraced PEDO sergeant sitting in jail for harming tourists on The Strip. The PPA president had to step in to protect our city from unconstitutional officers who tarnished the badge of leaderships who were not disciplined. If we truly want to protect the good constitutional officers, we must remove the ones who abuse their power.

Metro's general counsel fixing the Public Information Bureau would be a good start. Public record laws exist to hold the system accountable, yet violations in Nevada public records keep critical information hidden from the people. This protects the bad actors while exposing good officers to unnecessary risk. So, "why" is the best disinfectant. We demand transparency. We demand accountability and above all, we demand our police be protected from corrupt leadership that operates against American values. I love Metro, I love my friends who serve, but we need leadership to fix the leadership and secrecy issue. The law is on our side. It is time to enforce it and love our officers.

MR. ROJAS:
I live in Assembly District 12, Senate District 21. I am in strong, strong support of this bill. I support law enforcement, and we always want to I support our first responders.

JOSHUA MARTINEZ (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):
I am going to turn it over to our labor counsel down south, Jamie Frost, to put our opposition on the record.

JAMIE FROST (Labor Relations Counsel, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):
I am here to testify in opposition to S.B. 298. This language is an attempt to address a grievance decision where an arbitrator determined that, based on

LVMPD's collective bargaining agreement and its civil service rules, the department has the ability to deny someone's merit for performance or misconduct reasons. The increase in pay in that case was not given because the employee was on modified duty due to him being potentially demoted. There is no right in which an employee is entitled to an increase in pay. He was ultimately demoted, and he was entitled to a hearing on his demotion, and the demotion was ultimately upheld by an arbitrator.

The unions can certainly negotiate a process with the department for when increase in pay is withheld that may include back pay, and the department would be open to these negotiations. But instead of attempting to amend the civil service rules or negotiate the results of the decision to try and establish a process which would be grieveable with the department, the proposed language attempts to add a provision to every collective bargaining agreement in the State.

They have the right to negotiate limitations to an increase in pay that can be withheld, and they have currently in our collective bargaining agreement when increase in pay can be withheld, with regard to captains.

The NRS 288 states that discharge and disciplinary procedures are a mandatory subject of bargaining. The proposed bill would mandate that an arbitrator in any CBA grievance be bound by the evidentiary limitation outlined in this proposed bill. This is an attempt to negotiate a mandatory subject of bargaining without actually negotiating the subject.

Moreover, enforcement of and interpretation of the provisions of NRS 288 are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the EMRB. This amendment essentially takes the EMRB's authority and passes it on to arbitrators and fact finders. The language is vague and ambiguous and will lead to confusion, litigation and uncertainty. It hamstrings an arbitrator from being able to make a decision either way, as it prohibits an arbitrator from drawing an inference in favor of or against either party.

In every grievance, when a CBA is silent or the language is vague, an inference is being drawn for one party and against another. Moving to their post changes to NRS 289, Exhibit F, adding denial of an increase either in seniority or compensation is also vague and ambiguous and will have unanticipated far-reaching impacts.

This is not about pay being taken or decrease in pay. This is about an increase in pay and there's no property right to an increase in pay. That instead would have to be determined by negotiations. In order to be entitled to due process rights, the employee must have a right to the benefit. Pay is a mandatory subject of bargaining, and this change again impacts a mandatory subject of bargaining by making it a right to receive an increase in pay. Giving an employee a right to receive an increase in pay interferes with the language in [NRS] 288 and collective bargaining. Furthermore, this bill does not distinguish between probationary or nonprobationary employees, thereby potentially requiring an investigation and hearing for denial of merit increase in both circumstances.

Let me give you a couple of examples. A probationary employee not progressing in their training, possibly looking at being non-confirmed, and this bill potentially requires the department to conduct a full investigation and hearing in order to say the employee's not deserving a pay increase. Employees need to earn pay increases because it is not a right unless it is articulated and negotiated in the CBA.

Furthermore, someone on relief of duty, about to be terminated for potentially committing criminal acts while awaiting termination proceedings, this bill may require the department to conduct another investigation and hearing in order to say an employee is not deserving of a pay increase; its the exact officer we do not want getting a pay increase. And this is not just about merit. It is about seniority too. When you are on leave without pay, you are not entitled to seniority increases.

Denial of an increase in pay is vague. It could also mean promotions. In other words, if someone tests for promotion but is not ranked high enough to be promoted, it could potentially be interpreted to qualify as punitive action under [NRS] 289. This also interferes with rights provided in [NRS] 288 as promotions and promotional procedures are a management right.

Finally, if they want to add a back pay provision, then specifically state that. But in fact, this language does not even entitle the employee to back pay for a denial of a pay increase.

SENATOR ELLISON:
You're talking about what is happening between the arbitrator—but I do have a question. We took an oath to office says somebody's innocent until proven

guilty. But during that time, they are waiting to prove that if they are guilty or innocent unless they had to go, and be stepped down or leave until the investigation is over. My question is if that is the case and they are still on duty, even though they demoted them until after the arbitration, why would that count against them? It seems like to me, we all go by the letter of the law that you are innocent until proven guilty. But here it sounds like I might be seeing this wrong, and I might be wrong. It sounds like to me that you are being held to another accountability. Is that right or wrong?

MS. FROST:
That's why we do not decrease anyone's pay until we have abided by the disciplinary process. We have a whole disciplinary process that's been negotiated with all unions, specifically the PMSA, in this particular case. And until we go through the disciplinary process, an employee's pay is not decreased, but it is also not increased. There's no right to an increase in pay unless it is specifically stated in the collective bargaining agreement. In this case, it is not specifically stated. We might disagree on that, but nevertheless, that would be dictated by the collective bargaining agreement. So, in that particular case, no increase was given, but no decrease was also taken until we comply with the disciplinary process as negotiated with the PMSA, and then ultimately upheld by an arbitrator.

SENATOR DALY:
I will let Troyce go to any technical stuff on that. I would just, in my mind, try to clarify one thing. The opposition was saying that you are not entitled to an increase. There's no entitlement. I would just say if I bargained for a raise to go into effect on October 1, I certainly am filing a grievance if I do not get that raise on October 1. I am entitled to that. We're going to win that every time. I am not following that logic a little bit. That's my only comment.

MR. KRUMME:
I want to thank you for allowing some deference to the opposition side in allowing labor relations counsel Ms. Frost to go over the two minutes. I think it is important that she have an opportunity to answer those questions.

I am going to disagree that our step increases are not a right. In fact, they are a bargain for right. Wages are subject to mandatory bargaining. And in past we have bargained away certain steps. We have bargained where certain members when they promote what step they would land on, which would be an increase

from the previous contract to, so, to say that is not a right, as Senator Daly just said, we are going to disagree with that assertion being made, which is really the crux of the argument.

CHAIR FLORES:
It may be difficult to find middle ground here. I appreciate everybody who did come to me beforehand to address their concerns. With that, we will close the hearing on S.B. 298.

UNIDENTIFIED CALLER:
Is it possible for me to talk about a different bill that was not spoken today about or not?

CHAIR FLORES:
Anything that falls in the purview of Government Affairs. However, if it is a bill that we have heard already and or will be heard in the future, we would ask that you limit your comments to the date of that bill hearing, please.

UNIDENTIFIED CALLER:
Okay. Well, there is a bill out there regarding handling cars that are abandoned. And I was doing my research and there's a county in California called the Nevada County and they charge a dollar for DMV fees to handle these cars that are abandoned.

Now, I am electronics engineer ‘and believe me’ that they've hurt us more than to find out that many of the stuff that we are designing turned out to be toxic waste, within a year or two years. Now they are charging disposal fees: even when you go to have an oil change, you have a disposal fee. So, I am asking when that bill comes, it is an Assembly Bill, when it comes to you guys, when you want to consider, after all the testimonies, it is going to cost money to get these cars off the road, and they are causing havoc all over the State.

I am thinking that charging a dollar for every car and maybe two or three for an RV might be the solution because you are not going to dispose of this stuff for free. That is what I wanted to bring up to the Senate and we definitely need to get these cars off the road. I am a neighbor. I support, I am part of several neighborhood watch groups and these cars, especially on the east side where Ohrenschall is my Senator…

So you are seeing the problems that we are having, a lot of cars get dumped over here. It is something for you to think about and, hopefully, you guys can do your research. You guys are smart guys, and I think it is within our budget, you know. Let us not be penny-wise and a dollar short. I think it is a good decision.

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

CHAIR FLORES:
This meeting is adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Diane Rea,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Edgar Flores, Chair

DATE:

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	**Exhibit Letter**	**Introduced on Minute Report Page No.**	**Witness / Entity**	**Description**
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
S.B. 208	C	3	Senator John Steinbeck	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 208	D	3	Senator John Steinbeck	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 266	E	11	Senator Angela Taylor	Student Loan Repayment Presentation
S.B. 298	F	21	Senator Skip Daly	Proposed Amendment