



NEVADA LEGISLATURE SUNSET SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

(Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] 232B.210)

MINUTES

February 27, 2024

The second meeting of the Sunset Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission for the 2023–2024 Interim was held on Tuesday, February 27, 2024, at 9 a.m. in Room 3137, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401, Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the Entity meeting page. The audio or video recording may also be found at <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/>. Copies of the audio or video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) (publications@lcb.state.nv.us or 775/684-6835).

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Senator Skip Daly, Chair
Assemblyman Philip P.K. O'Neill

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Senator Roberta Lange
Assemblywoman Shea Backus

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS ATTENDING REMOTELY:

Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola, Vice Chair
Senator Robin L. Titus (Alternate for Senator Ira Hansen)

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Senator Ira Hansen (Excused)

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Chief Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division

Maria Velazquez, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division

Sarah Delap, Senior Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Jessica Dummer, Senior Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.
[Indicate a summary of comments.]

AGENDA ITEM I—CALL TO ORDER

[Chair Daly called the meeting to order. He welcomed members, presenters, and the public to the second meeting of the Sunset Subcommittee to the Legislative Commission for the 2023–2024 Interim. The Subcommittee Secretary took roll. Roll call is reflected in Subcommittee Members Present.]

Chair Daly:

As far as I know, we do not have any non-voting public members appointed by the Governor yet, when we get them, we will welcome those people to the Subcommittee.

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

[Chair Daly reviewed meeting and testimony guidelines.]

[Senator Daly called for public comment; however, no testimony was presented.]

AGENDA ITEM III—APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2024

We will move to the next Agenda Item III. I believe everyone had a chance to look at those. I read them over and they appear to be an order. Whenever somebody is ready, we can accept the motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARZOLA MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 26, 2024.

SENATOR LANGE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM IV—PRESENTATION ON BIENNIAL STATUS REPORT OF FINANCIAL INFORMATION RECEIVED BY THE AUDIT DIVISION, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU, FROM PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATION LICENSING BOARDS PURSUANT TO *NEVADA REVISED STATUTES 218G.400*

Chair Daly:

That will bring us to the next agenda item, I know we have people in Carson City ready to thrill us with the audit provision or audit information. Proceed whenever you are ready—one second before we start on that. My apologies, I meant to do this earlier, we have new Policy Analyst Alberto Quintero in Las Vegas today, he will be assisting with various committees throughout the interim. I wanted to make him feel welcome and give him the introduction he deserves. Thank you, please proceed.

Tammy Goetz, Audit Manager, Audit Division, LCB:

Good morning, Chair Daly and Members of the Sunset Subcommittee. I would like to take the opportunity to provide a high-level overview of the Audit Division's responsibilities followed by more detailed information regarding our oversight of State professional licensing boards.

The main function of the Audit Division is to conduct performance audits. Performance audits, provide objective information to improve program performance, contribute to public accountability, and facilitate decision making. Performance audit objectives vary widely and often include assessments of program effectiveness, efficiency, and compliance. I would like to highlight that our audits have generated tens of millions of dollars in monetary benefits, cost savings, and revenue enhancements. In addition to the financial aspect of our audits and arguably more importantly, many of our audits focus on program activities that significantly impact Nevada citizens. The Audit Division is statutorily required to audit all State agencies. Our audits must be approved by the Legislative Commission in the form of a Biennial Audit Plan. A special request from the Commission or audits can be mandated by legislation during session. For example, Assembly Bill 517 (2023) requires us to audit Washoe and Clark County School Districts and the State Public Charter School Authority.

Performance audits are our primary function, but we also handle various other duties. For example, we also contract for the State Single Audit and actively monitor the contractor's work and performance, which includes attending meetings at State agencies, reviewing the contractor's work in key areas, and helping the contractor deal with uncooperative agencies. Single audit reports are available on our website. The Audit Division also has certain responsibilities regarding child welfare. We conducted 29 inspections last year of facilities throughout the State that have physical custody of children, to evaluate whether these governmental and private facilities adequately protect the health, safety, and welfare of the children and respect their civil and other rights. Our annual reports are also on our website. Additionally, we review children fatalities in the State, each biennium we review about 70 case files of children that have had prior contact with a welfare agency who suffered a fatality or near fatality. The Legislative Auditor is required, by NRS 218G.550, to review case files to determine whether the case was handled in a manner consistent with State and federal law and to determine if any measures, procedures, or protocols could have assisted in preventing the fatality or near fatality. These reviews can require substantial time and often involve sensitive and egregious issues, but it is a very important function. We also monitor special license plates in cooperation with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). The Audit Division reviews financial information in the control processes of 25 charitable organizations that receive revenue from the special license plates. The purpose of this is to make sure the money is spent for the intended purpose. After our review, we issue a letter to the DMV Director.

The last significant function of the Audit Division I will highlight is the oversight of the State's professional licensing boards, which is why we are here today. First, the Audit Division infrequently conducts performance audits of licensing boards. Statutes provide that the Audit Division will audit a board when directed to do so by the Legislative Commission. Our most recent board audit was at the Board of Medical Examiners in 2019, Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada in 2016, and Nevada Board of Homeopathic Medical Examiners in 2006. We are not lobbying to do more performance audits of State boards due to their size and because our resources are stretched thin with audits of large agencies in the State such as Medicaid, DMV or Nevada's Department of Transportation (NDOT). However, when there is a specific problem with these boards that requires an audit, we can address those when directed. Chair, with your permission, I would like to turn the

presentation over to Laura Harwood to more thoroughly discuss her oversight of professional licensing boards.

Laura Harwood, Deputy Auditor, Audit Division, LCB:

Good morning. We have submitted a document dated February 8, 2024, ([Agenda Item IV](#)), the Biannual Status Report on Audits of Certain State Boards for January 2024. A copy of this report in the form of a letter is included as an exhibit to this meeting and a copy should be in front of you today, our previously issued letters are also available on the Audit Division website. Included in our analysis are the professional licensing boards. Our review does not include boards whose budgets fall under the Executive Budget as they have oversight through that process. Before I review the key points of our letter, I will provide a brief explanation of the financial reporting requirements of the boards. *Nevada Revises Statutes* 218G.400 requires certain boards be audited annually or biannually by contract auditors. The audit reports must be submitted to us by the board on or before December 1st of the year in which the audit is conducted. Boards with revenues less than \$200,000 for any fiscal year (FY) must complete a self-reported balance sheet and submit it to the Legislative Auditor and the Chief of the Budget Division. The Audit Division receives and reviews three types of financial reports from the boards.

The first type of report is the Annual Audited Financial Statement prepared by Certified Public Accountant (CPA) firms contracted by the boards. The audited financial statements provide an opinion as to whether the entity's financial statements are presented fairly in all material respects. Financial auditors also review internal controls and occasionally include findings in their audit reports. The second type of report, also for boards with revenues of \$200,000 or more, is a biannual report prepared by CPA firms. Instead of an annual audit, biannual audits are performed every two years. Boards that elect to complete biennial audits may not receive complete information on financial activities for a period of two years. This is because the completeness of the financial information depends on the quality and accuracy of self-generated unaudited financial information reported to the board between audits. However, cost savings can be realized with the biennial audit. Our previous survey of CPA firms estimated the biennial audit saved between 20 and 30 percent in costs over a two-year period. Most of the board audits do not specify how much an audit costs as those costs are reported with other professional fees. For the boards that did specify in previous years, the audit costs between \$7,000 and \$16,000 depending on the size of the board and the CPA firm. One of the smaller boards indicated to us this year that their audit costs were going to increase by 50 percent. The third type of financial report we receive from the board is the balance sheet. The smaller boards with revenues less than \$200,000 are required to provide self-reported balance sheet information on a form developed by the Audit Division; the balance sheet provides an overview of financial information, but this information is not audited. For example, we do not review invoices or other information to verify the expenditures and revenues. Although the balance sheet is not equivalent to an audit, we do review year-end bank statements, the fund balance, a schedule of revenues and expenditures, and other documentation that supports the balance sheet information. We also compare the balance sheets to prior years to identify any concerns with these entities.

Turning your attention now to our letter in your packet based on our reviews of the board's financial information, we report areas of concern and our biannual status report letters issued in January and July of each year. As indicated on page one of the letter dated February 8, 2024, the first area of concern we discuss is the financial report not filed by the Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada. The Board indicated their FY 2023 audit will be submitted following board approval at it is March 2024 Board meeting. The Board has not submitted financial statements timely for several years. Fiscal Year 2022 audited financial

statements were received by the Audit Division in October 2023, with a qualified opinion on governmental activities and an unmodified opinion on the General Fund. The audit included seven findings described at the bottom of page 1. On page 2, financial issues were also noted with some boards. Specifically, the Nevada Board of Homeopathic Medical Examiners has successfully transitioned financial information from prior years into an accounting system. Although the Board is still working on providing documentation from FY 2022 and responses for FY 2023 regarding differences in its bank reconciliation and other payments. We identified \$7,500 in cash withdrawals which the Board indicated were for Board member and staff compensation. We have requested additional information and are working with the Board to gain a better understanding of these cash transactions and possible accounting implications. For the State Board of Oriental Medicine, we are still working with the Board and their accountant on reconciling financial reporting differences.

Findings reported on board audits by external audits are stated on pages 2 and 3 of the letter. This is a new section resulting from a significant number of reportable audit findings this year. We attribute this increase in findings to boards hiring new auditors to review their financials. Sixteen out of 35 boards started working with new auditors this year and last year. Typically, new auditors viewing the financials with a new set of eyes will see additional issues that may have been overlooked by previous auditors. Three boards had reported significant findings starting on page 2. These boards include Board of Examiners for Social Workers, Nevada State Board of Optometry, and the State Board of Pharmacy. Several boards had less severe findings which are described on page 3. Although most of the findings appeared to have been addressed by the boards in FY 2023, we will remain cognizant of these findings during our FY 2024 review and report to the Legislature any repeat or significant findings in our January 2025 letter. As noted on page 4, we have a new board that was reviewed for FY 2023. Previously, under the Aging and Disability Services Division, the Board of Applied Behavior Analysis began operating as an independent entity beginning October 2021 per SB 217 of the 81st Legislative Session. The final item mentioned in our letter on page 5 is the regulatory and disciplinary filing requirements. Each regulatory board is required by NRS 622.100 to electronically submit a quarterly summary of disciplinary actions in addition to application and licensee information. All boards have submitted their required information to the LCB website for the proceeding for quarterly reporting periods. Page 6 is an attachment which shows basic financial information for the 35 occupational licensing boards that we review. It shows their basic revenues and expenditures to give an indication of the size of the boards. In summary, we hope all previously discussed concerns will be addressed and the Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada's audited financial statements will be received before we issue our July biannual letter. Each year in July, we provide updates on the outstanding issues we have identified in our January letter, which is the letter we are presenting now. Typically, the issues reported in January are resolved by the time we issue our July letter. However, this past year we reported outstanding issues with the Nevada Board of Homeopathic Medical Examiners.

Further, in the past embezzlement has been an area of concern. However, there have been no reports or indications of embezzlement or civil penalties since FY 2019, based on the information provided to us by the boards. That concludes my presentation, I would be happy to answer any questions at this time.

Chair Daly:

Thank you for that thorough presentation. Subcommittee Members, any questions for the Audit Division, before I ask mine? [There were no questions].

I have questions on the Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada. The seven findings you are indicating will be entered or will have a recommendation—either we have complied or in process—by the July letter?

Ms. Harwood:

Yes, we do expect to have those addressed. They should be addressed in March when they submit their 2023 audit. Typically, the audits will review the prior findings and let us know where they are with those.

Chair Daly:

For people that are habitually non-compliant—that requires legislative action—you do not have any enforcement authority through the Audit Division other than making your report, then the Legislature, the Executive Branch, or somebody would have to put their thumb on those agencies to comply?

Ms. Harwood:

Yes.

Chair Daly:

You do not have cops that go any place, right? You do not have enforcement authority, so if people are not complying, they are risking oversight or change in legislation and how they operate from the Legislature or the Executive Branch; I want to be clear because that is what I have been told. Usually, when I see the audit reports that you get, it is a letter of your findings and if they have answered with what they are doing to comply with those findings. Obviously, on the list that we have on page 4, there is a whole list of boards that can comply, so it can be done. Where do we go for people that will not do it? I noticed that the Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada—on your attachment—there are no numbers for them on that sheet.

Ms. Harwood:

That is correct, there are no numbers on that because they have not turned in FY 2023 yet.

Chair Daly:

We have the same issue with the Nevada Board of Homeopathic Medical Examiners, and I know this Subcommittee—not the same configuration—but this Subcommittee reviewed them last interim and requested them to provide a report back, which they still have not done. We will figure out what needs to be done from there. I heard rumors on some rearranging that may take place in the next legislative session—we will see. Are there any—besides ours—concerns over potential embezzlement or misappropriation spending besides the Executive Branch saying, “What are you guys doing?” or the Audit Division making sure to report back to the Legislature? Is there any oversight or contact with the Ethics Board on those types of things, because I know they have investigatory powers.

Ms. Harwood:

We have not had any contact with the Ethics Board on any issues; we have not had anything to discuss with them. What else was your question?

Chair Daly:

If there were issues or concerns over misappropriation of funds, embezzlement, or things that would be an ethics violation—in addition to several other things—I am curious if they have ever looked at your audits and had those questions themselves. I was looking for ways to make sure the boards and people who are entrusted and given the policy stating what they are supposed to do by the Legislature—that have been given a budget to carry out the policy as enacted by the Legislature—are doing so because when they do not do it, it causes concern and there are ramifications for that; we want to make sure people are aware. If the Ethics Commission has not investigated these types of things before, maybe they ought to be added to your list of audit reports.

Ms. Harwood:

In the past when there were issues with certain boards, the boards approached the Ethics Commission and they worked with them—so that is a resource that has been out there. I have seen when we report things in our letter to the Sunset Subcommittee, sometimes the Subcommittee would evaluate whether the board needs to do additional things like the extra letter, extra reporting, or reviewing through the Sunset Subcommittee, but our role is to report to you.

Chair Daly:

I understand, I am bringing up a few things. Maybe the Ethics Commission is listening and will want to investigate this. Final question, what is the status of the Homeopathic Board's response to this Subcommittee? They were required to give us a report and they have not done it yet, any idea on the status on that?

Ms. Harwood:

We have requested additional information and are working with the Board to gain a better understanding of those cash transactions; they have provided information that we have requested. We received it at the end of last week, and we are reviewing it to determine if we have additional questions or need to ask them for additional information. As of right now, we are working with the Board to determine if we have more questions.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Any other questions from the Subcommittee? Assemblyman O'Neill.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Thank you for a very interesting report. Going to [Agenda Item IV](#), the majority of these agencies' expenditures are higher than the revenues, how do they make up for that? What is the amount of savings they are allowed to roll over year-to-year, and how are they making up for excessive expenditures over revenue?

Ms. Harwood:

The question was when their expenditures are greater than their revenues, how are they operating? How much can they carry forward? We are not aware of any limit to what they are allowed to carry forward, but when they do have expenditures greater than revenues, they have reserves that allow them to continue. Does that answer your question?

Assemblyman O'Neill:

It does. They can have in their savings any amount they collect and build it up without ever looking at what their—if I understand correctly—dues would be because I assume the revenue is from dues of members, correct? Yes or no—I assume yes—from licensing or dues. Then, they are allowed to have it in that revenue category or in the savings category building up without it ever being questioned by audit?

Ms. Harwood:

Yes, that is correct, we are not aware of any limitations on that. In the past, I have heard that if the reserves get too high, the Sunset Subcommittee has evaluated their fees or asked the board to review their fees, but that is not something we do.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

That is where I was going, thank you.

Ms. Goetz:

I want to give you more information on one of your questions regarding the Board of Dental Examiners of Nevada. At the bottom of page 1, you asked about the findings that are stated there. Those are findings from their external auditor, not findings from LCB Audit. Those findings would be addressed during their next audit, which is the one that is going to be approved in March of 2024; we will see the responses to those findings at that time. The follow-up process would go through their external auditors as opposed to the LCB Audit directly.

Chair Daly:

Excellent, thank you. Any other questions? Seeing none, we will move on to the next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM V—PUBLIC HEARING CONCERNING TERMINATION, MODIFICATION, CONSOLIDATION, OR CONTINUED OPERATION OF CERTAIN ENTITIES PURSUANT TO *NEVADA REVISED STATUTES 232B.240*

Chair Daly:

We are going to have the public hearing concerning termination, modification, consolidation, or continued operation of certain entities pursuant to NRS 232B.240. We are going to Agenda Item V A to talk to the Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances Working Group. We have the Administrator of the Division of Environmental Protection, Jennifer Carr and a colleague, proceed whenever you are ready.

A. PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES WORKING GROUP (NEVADA REVISED STATUTES 459.686)

Jennifer Carr, P.E., Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR):

Good morning, Chair Daly, and Members of the Subcommittee. With me today is Andrea Sefer, Chief of the NDEP Bureau of Safe Drinking Water.

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the creation, use, and potential sunseting of the Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl Substance (PFAS) Working Group ([Agenda Item V A-1](#)). As has been discussed in this legislative body for the past two sessions, these fluorinated substances are also commonly referred to in American lingo as “forever chemicals”. In 2021, Assemblyman Watts sponsored AB 97 to initiate discussion on the regulation of PFAS in Nevada. At the time NDEP had a snapshot of initial drinking water data related to PFAS in some water supplies that were tested under a federal United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) program. The NDEP did not have much data or extensive knowledge on Nevada's manufacturer use or occurrence of PFAS in the environment, but we had begun efforts to expand our knowledge and understanding, as well as initiate work using various EPA grants or to tend environmental protection (EP) in 2020. Assembly Bill 97 supported these initial efforts as the creation of the PFAS Working Group worked hand-in-hand with NDEP's need for external stakeholder participation and ultimately to create the PFAS action plan that was completed in June of 2022. The PFAS Working Group was codified into NRS, as we discussed in our Sunset Subcommittee review form ([Agenda Item V A-2](#)). The NDEP used existing resources to create and manage the PFAS Working Group and the open call for external participants was broad. Stakeholders included representatives from academia; aviation; environmental consultants; drinking water and wastewater operators; state, local, and federal government; laboratories; labor organizations; and trade groups and environmental groups. Representation by stakeholders was comprehensive and exceeded the types of representatives contemplated by the law.

The Working Group was successful in its mission and has completed the duties outlined in NRS and no future meetings are anticipated. The NDEP has a federal delegation for implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Clean Water Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Clean Air Act, and other various State authorities to address environmental contaminants of concern. The US EPA is on the cusp of publishing a final rule setting standards for several PFAS compounds in drinking water. Long story short, going forward NDEP is committed to continuing the use of our existing authorities and to address PFAS on multiple fronts in the future. Therefore, we believe the PFAS Working Group can be considered for termination. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the potential to sunset the PFAS Working Group. Thank you for your time, and we are happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chair Daly:

Thank you, we will have questions, I know I do. Subcommittee Members, any question? Senator Titus.

Senator Titus:

Thank you for the presentation, and I appreciate the work that you have done. Has Assemblyman Watts made any comments about the sunseting? Did you achieve what his goal was when he presented this bill?

Ms. Carr:

Yes, DCNR did reach out to Assemblyman Watts in the last few weeks and he concurred via email that with the tasks set forth in statute having been addressed, he felt it was appropriate to consider disbanding the Working Group and ceasing to meet.

Senator Titus:

Great, thank you. I looked through the attached information and did not see anything from him, but I appreciate that and thank you for what you have done.

Chair Daly:

Any additional questions, Subcommittee Members? Seeing none, I have a couple questions and a comment. I had on my things to do, to reach out to Assemblyman Watts, but I am glad you beat me to it. If I understood correctly—and I want to reiterate—the legislation that passed in 2021, was to have or be a catalyst for the State to start looking into this if we had not already, and the report you gave was a steppingstone to coordinate with the people working on this at the federal level. It is my understanding that you already have authority under the NDEP to investigate similar situations in the future without legislation or the Working Group?

Ms. Carr:

The short answer is yes, we have the authorities we need to continue to address PFAS in various environmental media going forward under those various federal acts that we are obligated to implement, as well as existing State law.

Chair Daly:

The second half is clarification to make sure we had the information needed on the record. In addition to what Assemblyman Watts' bill did in 2021, to get the State focused and at least starting on that. The federal government at the same time was looking at these forever chemicals in several different areas on air, water, human cause, carcinogens, and those things. Those rules are nearly complete and the State—along with all the other states—are going to have to comply and follow those regulations in the administration of those chemicals in the State of Nevada. The federal government is already duplicating a lot of this, we will have to have to comply with.

Ms. Carr:

Yes, this has been an issue in various parts of the country for many years now, particularly where PFAS is manufactured. We do not have PFAS manufacturing in Nevada, which has been very much a benefit to the health and welfare of the citizens of the State of Nevada. We are coming into this a bit further down the road than other states and because of that, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency had already started a lot of work to regulate PFAS. First, in drinking water; the maximum contaminant levels for drinking water are set to come out any day. We thought we might have them by now, but they are not out yet. When that occurs, Ms. Sefert's group will be actively engaged in bringing those rules into Nevada, adopting them by reference, and implementing the PFAS drinking water standards. The US EPA is also working on regulating PFAS in other environmental media like wastewater, things like that. This is the beginning, but we can regulate this using all the federal and State laws we have at our disposal.

Chair Daly:

I know there was concern with firefighters and firefighting foam. Apparently, they used these chemicals for a period of time. My understanding is they have changed, and it is no longer the case. Have the firefighters' issues been addressed in other ways?

Ms. Carr:

Yes, there are PFAS compounds in Aqueous Film Forming Foams (AFFF). They are in the process of being transitioned out in the State of Nevada. It is my understanding this discussion has been ongoing at the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC), and we have been tracking that conversation as well as being a partner to the SERC.

Chair Daly:

Excellent, and thank you for the recommendation. We always ask that, and I know it was on the form as well. We do not have a work session on our agenda today but for Subcommittee Members, we will be looking for that. There will be a work session on all our agendas going forward, we will take this up at our next meeting. Final chance, any additional questions for the forever chemical folks? Seeing none, we will move on to the next item.

B. STATE 4-H CAMP ADVISORY COUNCIL (NEVADA REVISED STATUTES 550.035)

Chair Daly:

Agenda Item V B is the State 4-H Camp Advisory Council.

Kenny Haack-Damon, 4-H Camp Education Program Coordinator, University of Nevada Reno (UNR):

Good morning, to give you context on the 4-H Camp and Advisory Council, every year since 1938—with the exception of 2022—Nevada 4-H has been hosting camps at the Lake Tahoe Camp facility. In 1953, the ownership of the Camp was transferred to the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension and the Board of Regents. The purpose of the State 4-H Camp is to provide a living and learning environment in a natural setting. With 4-H and other youth groups they can learn life, leadership, and citizenship skills as well as appreciation for nature. Like I said, that is been happening since 1938 at the Camp facility.

The objective and purpose of the Nevada 4-H Camp Advisory Council is to advise the Dean and Directors of the UNR Extension or their designee on the physical development of the Camp, and provide recommendations on how to make sure we are meeting the needs and goals of the 4-H Camp Program. At this point, we feel that the Committee is working properly and should continue to work the way it has. We meet quarterly and have a meeting scheduled in April. Other than a few proposed changes to wording we submitted—the wording around the University has changed. For instance, the Director which is defined as the Director of Agricultural Extension Department—a more appropriate phrase would be, the Director of the UNR Extension, to be current with what is happening. ([Agenda Item V B-1](#)) ([Agenda Item V B-2](#)) ([Agenda Item V B-3](#)) ([Agenda Item V B-4](#)) ([Agenda Item V B-5](#)) ([Agenda Item V B-6](#))

Other than that, the Committee should continue to function the way it has because there is an important safeguard built in, in case there is ever a chance the University or the Board of Regents wants to get rid of the facility. There is language in State statute that says that the Advisory Board must vote and agree; we think that is an important part of the State statute so we can continue to have the Camp. I do not foresee the University wanting to sell it, but if that did happen we would have a safeguard with the Advisory Council having an input.

Chair Daly:

Your recommendation is for continuation with potential legislation to clear up using the right name and various things—adding a designee in certain areas of the statute. I appreciate it, Subcommittee, any questions? I believe it was Assemblywoman Backus that wanted to review this Board, go ahead if you are ready.

Assemblywoman Backus:

I think the concern was whether the Advisory Council was meeting and looking at the response to question 18. Your testimony today, it appears the Advisory Council meets quarterly; we appreciate that information. Just out of curiosity, I am imagining this being a camp facility, how many students or 4-H members attend the Camp each year?

Mr. Haack-Damon:

The facility holds 254 campers when it is at full capacity. We host between two and five camps each summer, so there are 300 to 700 campers per year. Those numbers obviously fluctuate year to year, but in that neighborhood.

Assemblyman Backus:

Since the purpose of the Camp facility is to foster and support Nevadans who might go into farming, do you ever follow Camp members to see if they return to rural communities in Nevada and go into farming or other industries that are pertinent to what the 4-H Camp facilitates?

Mr. Haack-Damon:

I do not know that. I agree that the purpose is for those youth to go on to farming. I think it is more important that they are building life skills needed to be productive in a number of different fields. We have Camps specifically focused on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) so the short answer is we do track them. Not necessarily through the Camp, but through their participation in 4-H, they are evaluated to see what happens.

Chair Daly:

Thank you for that. Assemblyman O'Neill.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

You said you meet quarterly, the records indicate you meet quarterly, but in the report that we got to start our meetings, it indicated that your last meeting was July 7, 2020. Can you explain the discrepancy to me, for clarification?

Mr. Haack-Damon:

There should have been meeting minutes that were part of what was submitted, it should have been 2023 into 2024. I do not believe that the 2024 meeting minutes were uploaded up to that document.

Chair Daly:

I believe our Policy Analyst may have an answer, hopefully shed some light. Mr. Guinan?

Mr. Guinan:

That is correct. We did not have a record of those meetings when we put the form together and their answer has clarified that. Although, when we tried to upload those meeting minutes from the Dropbox address, we could not access them. I can get that information and include it in the record—I was not able to do that by today—I needed to talk to Mr. Haack-Damon about it. He is accurate in that they have met much more recently.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I appreciate that, and I appreciate the work that you are doing, particularly going into STEM fields and the work of 4-H. The conflict bothered me, and I wanted to clarify on the record.

Mr. Haack-Damon:

We are happy to provide those if you were not able to access them.

Senator Titus:

This is a statement more than a question. I want to thank you for keeping this vital activity an option and opportunity for 4-H students throughout the State to attend this beautiful location. If any of the legislators on this Subcommittee have not been to this Camp, they should go; it is a beautiful little spot up at Lake Tahoe. That is an opportunity for all our students—to be there—and it does not just focus on farming. Quite the contrary, there are STEM opportunities, and it is an experience that kids remember forever. My children have participated in it and my mother, and her siblings were all participants of this Camp in the 1930s. I want to thank you; it is such an integral part of our history in the State of Nevada. Thank you for being an advocate for it and thank you for the continuation.

Chair Daly:

I have a couple of questions, and I think you might have answered part of it. You said that the State or University have owned the location since 1938? Is it the State or the University System that owns the property?

Mr. Haack-Damon:

My understanding is the University owns the property, and the first Camps took place in the facility in 1938—that was before the University owned the facility. In 1953, the ownership was transferred to the University and Extension through the Board of Regents.

Chair Daly:

So, it is owned by the University System and by extension, the State, but the University System. When they acquired that—I know you mentioned the stuff about the requirements—if they were going to change that. It is operated under the University System as a nonprofit. Is that correct?

Mr. Haack-Damon:

We are operated as a self-supporting budget through the University, so all the funds to run the facility have to come through—we have to balance our budget every year with fees that campers pay, and we use the facility for 4-H for outside user groups, when we are not using

it. Fees that we get from outside user groups do support the salaries, maintenance, and upkeep of the facility.

Chair Daly:

When I was reading the information you submitted on your potential for legislative changes, in your committee meetings—on reviewing those types of things—one of the concern was potential sale, misuse, or transfer of that. I wanted to explore more on that because I and a couple of others are on the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Oversight Committee, so we have interest in that. Run us through what would have to happen if there was potentially going to be a sale, transfer, or switching from nonprofit administration to the University. Obviously, you want to have revenue, but the revenue should not all flow to the State—if you have a gift shop or whatever. I think you probably already have that, run us through that quickly.

Mr. Haack-Damon:

My understanding is if there was going to be any transfer of real property from the current state, it would have to be approved by the Board of Regents and by the University, then the Advisory Board would have to also approve the sale or transfer of property.

Chair Daly:

My understanding—if I read it correctly—when I looked up the statute, you reference that it would also have to be approved by the Governor?

Mr. Haack-Damon:

I believe so.

Chair Daly:

Other than that litany of people, is there anyone else that would have to approve? There is no deed restriction or anything on that property so they cannot be transferred or misused? When it was purchased, there was no grant or deed restrictions that came with that?

Mr. Haack-Damon:

Not that I am aware of.

Chair Daly:

Those were the questions I had, and we will look into that. Can you—before our next meeting or before we finish—if we are going to make recommendations, try to refine and get it down to bullet point suggestions on what changes in language you might recommend—if we go that direction? I do not think you are on the chopping block to be discontinued, but there is clean up that can be done. I am interested in restrictions on the sale of the property language to make sure it is as strong as we can have it be. Finally, I have a comment—and maybe you have information on this. It is my understanding—and very few people know, I did not know until a couple of years ago—that building trades and apprenticeship programs, by affiliation, are considered part of the federal 4-H program. When you talk about 4-H participants, apprentices, and apprenticeship programs for the construction trades they are participants of 4-H—whether they go through your process in

the Camp and various things for national purposes—my understanding is those apprentices are part of 4-H and have access to the resources.

Mr. Haack-Damon:

We submitted a proposal for changes that have all the language updates that we would propose ([Agenda Item V B-4](#)); proposed changes to NRS 550, State 4-H Camp Advisory Board. To the second part, yes, any youth programming that happens within extension is technically 4-H programming, it all goes to 4-H. It all must follow proper youth development principles, including trades. Historically, people have thought of 4-H as livestock and animals and it is still a big part of it, but as we expand, we try to become engaged in other aspects of the communities, not just rural Nevada but urban and rural settings. Seeing these as well but moving into STEM; a lot of other areas where we can engage youth and provide that same opportunity for growth.

Chair Daly:

I was pointing out that you did submit your potential legislative changes, and I did not know if that was all of them—if they are part of your Working Group discussions or if those were the formal recommendations. We can expand on that if there are any further, and I wanted to be clear, our staff was making sure I knew as well. Subcommittee, any further questions before we let him go? Seeing none. Thank you.

C. CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS' BOARD OF NEVADA (NEVADA REVISED STATUTES 656.040)

Chair Daly:

That brings us to Agenda Item IV C, the Certified Court Reporters Board; they are in Las Vegas. Proceed whenever you are ready. Do you have one person on Zoom as well?

Lisa McGrane, Chair, Certified Court Reporters' Board of Nevada:

We have one person in Carson City, as an observer only. Good afternoon, Senator Daly, and Members of the Sunset Subcommittee. Thank you for the invitation to be here today. I am here in my role as Chair of the Nevada Certified Court Reporters' Board. I am joined by two of my fellow board members, Kevin Diamond, a practicing attorney and shareholder at Thorndal Armstrong PC, and William C. LaBorde, a court reporter and court reporter firm owner. Also in the audience today, we are joined by our Executive Secretary, Debbie O'Hara, who has done a remarkable job overseeing the organization's operations for the past 19 years. I would also note that Board Member Linda Shaw is present in Carson City, as an observer today. Linda was recently appointed to the Board. She is a certified court reporter with extensive experience as both a reporter and court reporter firm owner. There are five members on the Board, three certified court reporters, one attorney, and one public member. I am the Deputy Executive Director of the State Bar in Nevada and serve in that public member role. I am pleased to report that all board positions are filled notably, all but one of us is serving in our first term. While we rely heavily on the expertise and historical knowledge of our one court reporter serving in her last term, the current Board is committed to drawing upon our limited resources to provide efficient and effective means for regulating certified court reporters in the State of Nevada. Court reporters serve an important role in our judicial system and in the public interest. ([Agenda Item V C-1](#)) ([Agenda Item V C-2](#)) ([Agenda Item V C-3](#))

In fact, the Court Reporters' Board was established in 1973, because the practice of making a verbatim judicial record affects the public health, safety, and welfare of Nevada's citizens. Today, there are 261 certified court reporters in the State and another 37 court reporting firms authorized to do business. The Certified Court Reporters' Board carries out its obligations to the judicial system and to Nevadans by ensuring that license holders possess basic skills as well as the knowledge of applicable laws, regulations, and court and procedural rules governing the practice in our State. Court reporters serve in a capacity that puts them in the center of what can be contentious litigation affecting the personal lives of the litigants. It is therefore important that we fulfill our obligations to administer licensing exams for court reporters and court reporting firms desiring to do business here. The exams are overseen by an Exam Subcommittee and are administered four times a year. The exams test skills as well as the knowledge of applicable laws including HIPAA compliance, protection of personal information, and professional ethics. Passage of both the Nevada exam and a national skills exam are required prior to licensure. The regulation of court reporters also protects the integrity of the judicial system. A transcript provided by a certified court reporter informs the Board that the transcript is accurate and truthfully reflects the words spoken at a hearing or deposition. Finally, as I mentioned previously, the Certified Court Reporters' Board is committed to using our limited resources to provide effective and efficient operations, making the process for obtaining and renewing a license as seamless as possible. For example, last year, the Board authorized acceptance of credit cards, as well as the electronic delivery of renewal notices. Again, we thank the Subcommittee for its work here today and providing us an opportunity to share the work we do to license and regulate certified court reporters in the State.

I would now like to hand the mic off to Board Member Kevin Diamond to provide a brief update on proposed legislation for the next session.

Kevin Diamond, Board Member, Certified Court Reporters' Board of Nevada:

I grew up in Las Vegas since I was five years old and went to Las Vegas High School when it was downtown. I have been practicing law for 31 years; 24 with the Thorndal Armstrong Firm and I will give it a plug since they are the oldest law firm in the State. My dear friend Patrick Murphy, who unfortunately has passed, was the attorney member for the Nevada Certified Court Reporters' Board. When he was coming close to the conclusion of his service, he asked if I would have an interest and I indicated that I did. I have been serving the Board for the past year, and I started a couple of months ago as the Chair of the Legislation and Regulations Committee, so I am getting my feet wet.

As I began, I had a large task list that everyone had on the Committee as Governor Lombardo wanted to streamline legislation and regulations and have boards try to simplify. We are governed by *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) and NRS Chapter 656. We have been working hard and learning as we go, especially from the LCB. We did comply and are trying our best to comply with the Governor's request by removing more than ten regulations and simplifying many others; we have also been striving for consistency internally and externally. In addition, we have been working on simplifying disciplinary issues and dealing with guiding our reporters in their dealings with third parties should that occur. Finally, we are assisting in bringing more business to Nevada—something else that Governor Lombardo would like to see—by clarifying issues as it pertains to reciprocity for court reporters who are out of state and then come to Nevada, which we are seeing more of as we go.

Thank you for your time. We would be happy to answer any questions that the Subcommittee may have.

Chair Daly:

I am the one that called this Board. Are there any questions from the rest of the Subcommittee before we proceed? I am not seeing any.

I remember seeing Mr. Diamond at the Legislative Commission; answer number 12 on your sheet asked for the last five regulations adopted and you listed R193-22 as being adopted, but as I recall, that was deferred and not adopted. Is that correct?

Mr. Diamond:

That is correct. That has been deferred, and we are continuing to work on the language with the LCB. Ms. O'Hara and I had a meeting with the LCB yesterday to go over concerns you had during our conference. I think we are to be able to clean up those issues.

Chair Daly:

I am hoping we are, because I have questions and I have tried to talk with as many people as I can. We have two attorneys on this Subcommittee who may be able to help as well, but as you recall, the concern was over a third party being able to get a copy, and whose property the actual documents belong to. Are you working on clarification on that, because the third party being able to get a hold of that—in the way you had it set up with the 60 days—in my view, is not going to work. The more people I have talked to—that process, I believe is backwards. Are you working on trying to determine—after you have provided your service and have been paid—whom that work product belongs to?

Mr. Diamond:

One of the concerns that came up was about arbitrations and the definition of proceeding. That is something we discussed yesterday—whether we want to remove arbitrations from that definition to try to simplify that area since proceeding has to do with a hearing that is subject to judicial review. As to ownership of the product, as I stated when we had the last hearing, essentially the original belongs to the attorney who asked for the court reporter—that is the attorney who will get the sealed copy—say it is a deposition and we end up at trial. The actual work product is that of the court reporter because if there is a request for a copy, that has to go through the court reporter as part of their business, we can work on that more. I know that is a concern, and that is something we are going to attempt to address.

Chair Daly:

I think it is a concern, and I know there is this bifurcation or process that exists now and then you have the bifurcation between an arbitration or mediation—things that may want to have a court reporter—have a document that are never going to court. Those are private issues outside of the issue. I know we have process and procedures where the parties in a particular case—where the deposition or hearing is held—they have a right to that and yes, they have to pay the court reporter for a certified copy, I do not disagree with that. I think this can be addressed by adding in rules that say; if someone is requesting this, is going to use it, or it is going to be cited in a brief—whatever it might be—they have to be working from a certified copy they acquired from the court reporter so everybody can be certain that was the actual word spoken.

Mr. Diamond:

We are grateful that you brought up arbitrations because that is not something that we were focusing on when putting this together. Primarily because that is something that our court reporters are rarely asked to record, it is something that is done so rarely that it was not an issue we brought up, but now that you brought it up, we are working on trying to clarify that issue which is going to be helpful for everyone.

Chair Daly:

I appreciate it. After speaking with a few people, I have gotten different opinions. Some people say, "Oh no, this is great, we are going to be able to get these as third parties." When they are looking to see expert testimony for impeachment purposes in a different case—it may be years later; completely unrelated. Some of what I was looking at and thinking—and hope to work with you as we move forward with recommendation and potential legislation—I think a person who is giving expert testimony, there would be a lower level of scrutiny on being able to get that as third-party experts. People giving expert testimony are generally professional and know what they are doing, and people would use that regularly in cases for impeachment purposes and various things. Some of the other stuff that needs to have a higher level of third-party access. It was brought to my attention by an attorney that some portions of hearings, or things that are going to be presented to the court, are disputes between two companies. There may be proprietary information, there may be trade secret type information that is discussed at a deposition and the attorney would ask for the court to protect that type of testimony. Then the situation of, if there is protective order on it; I think it is clear you will not give it up. Who is then responsible for redacting that information? Is it the court reporter, or is the court reporter going to do it and charge an extra fee for that? There is a variety of things that I do not think we fully thought out in that original regulation that you came forward with. I think this should be addressed in statute, those are issues that have come up in my discussions, feel free to comment.

Mr. Diamond:

I do not disagree that we can try to add more specificity to the statute—to the regulation. Oftentimes, the court has already intervened, or the parties have entered into a confidentiality stipulation that people would be bound by, but you are correct, and your foresight is correct. There are times when parties may not have considered that until a request comes, which of course is why we want to allow 60 days for an objection to be made, then the court can intervene again. It would be much easier if there was a stipulation—but if there was not a stipulation—that our reporters had some type of guidance that could help them in situations such as this.

Chair Daly:

Agreed. There was discussion by the Chair of the Legislative Commission about the 60 days; how that would work, who had the onus, the timing of that—whether that would work. I indicated that it was almost backwards, the third party should have the onus to say, I have to go to court, and tell them to let me have it. There is no reason it should not be disclosed. Rather than saying the party has to stop, the third-party request and go to court to do that. I think that is backwards but all things we can discuss as we go forward.

Was there legislation in 2023? I do not recall any regarding the videography issue. Are they covered by the court reporter statutes and regulations? Do they create a written document or just the video? Are they completely unregulated at this point? How is that affecting the

court reporters, the business, and the courts? I think that is going to become more prevalent; if it is not regulated now, we need to have some parameters on that.

Mr. Diamond:

We appreciate that you brought that up, and I do not know that today's hearing is going to allow enough time for me to go into all the issues that have arisen with the videographers and the need for them to be regulated. I am not sure of the legislative lingo, but I think it died in Committee—or I forget exactly. We were ready to testify and provide information in Carson City, when this came up in 2023. We were loaded and ready to go, then we were told by our sponsoring Senator to not worry about it, it was not going to be heard. It is an extremely unfortunate issue that must be addressed, because it affects the health, welfare, and justice systems. The videographers show up without a certified court reporter, having a notary license to record, then they present their recording to a third-party reporter that might not be certified. It is a mess, and we would love to have an opportunity to try to pass that legislation; we think it is reasonable legislation. There is quite a bit of opposition from the companies that have videographers and from the plaintiff bar, who we believe benefit financially from how the charges work by the videographers. There is no regulation or oversight, the only real regulation or oversight comes from our judges. I can talk about this firsthand because I had this issue, most judges will not accept a transcript for use at trial that was not reported by a certified court reporter. That creates a huge issue because for example, if there was a deposition taken and it was recorded by a videographer then given to some third-party to type up, then everyone forgets about it and you go to trial and the judge says, "Wait a second, this deposition is not certified. You cannot use it." All of a sudden you are stuck; you have to take another deposition and there is a number of things that could cause problems. The only "oversight" is the judges. In at least two instances—there was a couple in Reno also—but two in Las Vegas—that we know of, where judges said "No, we are not going to allow this transcript to be utilized," and parties had to go back to the drawing board. We look forward to the opportunity to argue this, and discuss it with the Legislature to try to get this pushed through.

Chair Daly:

You said you had a sponsoring Senator, I would like to follow up with that, if you can tell me who it was.

Mr. Diamond:

It was Senator Hammond, although I believe he is no longer in the Senate.

Chair Daly:

No worries, that gives me all the information I need. I do think there are issues and things that need to be thought out. I understand the people doing the videography—I am not sure why they would have resistance to being regulated and having their information be under the regulatory board and under guidance—it would increase their business, not decrease it. I think they would welcome that. Transcribed onto that, there is advantages to videography on some of that, you cannot get inflections in the voice, you cannot get a variety of different things through a printed transcript, but you can through the video. They would become the norm in tandem, but think we have to rein that in.

Last question, there was something about videography being covered under NRS, is that not the case? I thought I read something about SB 406, I am not sure what year.

Mr. Diamond:

Maybe we can recruit you to be our sponsor, Senator. As it pertains to the *Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure* (NRCP) Rule 30, it allows for depositions by different methods including by video, but it does not disincentivize or say that you do not need a certified court reporter to have the proper transcript. We are on the other side of the issue, but we believe that the videographers are misinterpreting or taking NRCP 30 out of context by trying to make it more inclusive than it really is. There is a dispute as to that language, but there is a strong disagreement about whether it allows for a deposition without a certified court reporter.

Chair Daly:

Part of what this Subcommittee does is give a full and thorough report to the Legislative Commission for potential legislative changes in this regard, including videography, how third parties are handled, the level of scrutiny being lowered for testimony by experts, and who would do the redacting without getting too complicated. Some of that may be left to regulation, but there are a variety of things that need to be cleared and vetted. Hopefully we can work through this Subcommittee, and give a thorough comprehensive report to the Legislative Commission on recommendations for legislation regarding these issues. I look forward to talking with you.

Subcommittee Members, any other questions? Assemblyman O'Neill.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I noticed that several of your meetings are public, and a few are closed meetings. What are the generalized statements you can give me that are discussed, or why do they need to be closed? In government, we try to move to transparency as much as possible, so I am curious as to how you determine closed versus open.

Ms. McGrane:

The only time we conduct closed meetings is to grade exams. Everything else is done in the public.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Thank you for that clarification.

Chair Daly:

Subcommittee Members and attorneys, any additional questions or comments? Seeing none.

Assemblywoman Backus:

Chair Daly, I pulled up Senator Hammond's bill, it is SB 160 from the 2023 Session.

Chair Daly:

Senate Bill 160, thank you Assemblywoman, I appreciate that. Seeing no other questions or comments. I thank you for presenting this morning, and I look forward to following up on some issues between now and our final meeting. If we have questions, we will bring you back at a later date. Moving on to our next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM VI—SELECTION OF BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND SIMILAR ENTITIES FOR REVIEW DURING THE 2023–2024 INTERIM

Chair Daly:

[Agenda Item VI](#), selection of boards, commissions, and similar entities for review during the 2023–2024 Interim. I gave a list to our Policy Analyst, Mr. Guinan, so I will hand it over to him to go over the list, then we will look for a motion. If anybody wants to add something, keep in mind we have eight, and we are going to add seven more. We have a limited amount of time and a firm deadline of June 30th to report back to the Legislative Commission.

Mr. Guinan:

Members and the public, you will see a list of boards ([Agenda Item VI](#)) proposed by Chair Daly for your review today. I will run down the names of those for you.

The first, is the Subcommittee on Computer Science of the Advisory Council on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics; second, is the Commission to Review the Compensation of Constitutional Officers, Legislators, Supreme Court Justices, Judges of the Court of Appeals, District Judges and Elected County Officers; third, is the State Public Charter School Authority; fourth, is the Council to Establish Academic Standards for Public Schools; fifth, is the Advisory Committee on Medicaid Innovation; sixth is the Advisory Board on Automotive Affairs; and last, is the Rangeland Resources Commission. I drew these from the list we put together after our first meeting, it contained entities other Members also wanted to look at.

Chair Daly:

Thank you, Mr. Guinan. Any comments or questions? I will take a motion unless someone wants to add something before we move to the motion.

Chair Daly:

Assemblywoman Backus or Senator Lange, whoever is first?

Senator Lange:

I am interested in the Commission on Postsecondary Education. I was made aware of a situation with that Commission last week, and I am looking to see if it is applicable to this Subcommittee, if it is, could we add it to our list?

Chair Daly:

Mr. Guinan is going to double check. I do not have an objection to adding it if that is your pleasure, we do not want to get too many. Assemblywoman Backus, did you have a comment?

Assemblywoman Backus:

I did not, the committees I raised at the last hearing have already been captured.

Chair Daly:

Vice Chair Marzola.

Vice Chair Marzola:

I do not have any comments, ditto on what Assemblywoman Backus stated.

Chair Daly:

Thank you and no offense, Senator Titus, but Senator Hansen is missing out on his chance.

Senator Titus:

Yeah, I agree.

Chair Daly:

He did not have any the first go around either. Assemblyman O'Neill.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

I would like to add the Nevada High Speed Rail Authority. I did not see them on there.

Chair Daly:

The Nevada High Speed Rail Authority was adopted last meeting. We are having difficulty reaching them, they may be on the next agenda or the agenda after, but we are going to review the Nevada High Speed Rail Authority.

Mr. Guinan, I will have you read the list after a motion is made. Can I get a motion to adopt the eight additional boards for review this interim?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARZOLA MOVED TO ADD THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMPUTER SCIENCE OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING AND MATHEMATICS; THE COMMISSION TO REVIEW THE COMPENSATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS, LEGISLATORS, SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, JUDGES OF THE COURT OF APPEALS, DISTRICT JUDGES AND ELECTED COUNTY OFFICERS; THE STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY; THE COUNCIL TO ESTABLISH ACADEMIC STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS; THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MEDICAID INNOVATION; THE ADVISORY BOARD ON AUTOMOTIVE AFFAIRS; THE RANGELAND RESOURCES COMMISSION; AND THE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION BOARD TO THE LIST OF ENTITIES FOR REVIEW BY THE SUNSET SUBCOMMITTEE IN THE 2023-2024 INTERIM.

SENATOR LANGE SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM VII—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Daly:

Moving on to Agenda Item VII, public comment.

Is there anybody in Las Vegas that would like to provide public comment? Likewise, we have no one in Carson City here for public comment. Broadcast, do we have anybody on the phone for public comment?

BPS:

The public line is open and working, but there are no callers to provide public comment at this time.

Chair Daly:

Thank you, with that we will close Agenda Item VII. We will move on to Agenda Item VIII, which is adjournment.

AGENDA ITEM VIII—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Subcommittee, the meeting was adjourned at 10:34 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Velazquez
Research Policy Assistant

Patrick Guinan
Chief Principal Policy Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Senator Skip Daly, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item IV	Laura Harwood, Deputy Auditor, Audit Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB)	Biannual Status Report on Audits, January 2024
Agenda Item V A-1	Jennifer Carr, Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR)	Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances Working Group Background Information
Agenda Item V A-2	Jennifer Carr, Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, DCNR	2024 Sunset Review Form
Agenda Item V B-1	Kenny Haack-Damon, 4-H Camp Education Program Coordinator, University of Nevada Reno (UNR)	Background Information
Agenda Item V B-2	Kenny Haack-Damon, 4-H Camp Education Program Coordinator, UNR	2024 Sunset Review Form
Agenda Item V B-3	Kenny Haack-Damon, 4-H Camp Education Program Coordinator, UNR	Strategic Planning Document
Agenda Item V B-4	Kenny Haack-Damon, 4-H Camp Education Program Coordinator, UNR	Organizational Chart State
Agenda Item V B-5	Kenny Haack-Damon, 4-H Camp Education Program Coordinator, UNR	Proposed Changes to <i>Nevada Revised Statute</i> 550
Agenda Item V B-6	Kenny Haack-Damon, 4-H Camp Education Program Coordinator, UNR	Advisory Council Minutes
Agenda Item V C-1	Lisa McGrane, Chair, Certified Court Reporters' Board of Nevada	Background Information

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
<u>Agenda Item V C-2</u>	Lisa McGrane, Chair, Certified Court Reporters' Board of Nevada	Sunset Review Forms
<u>Agenda Item V C-3</u>	Lisa McGrane, Chair, Certified Court Reporters' Board of Nevada	Supporting Documentation
<u>Agenda Item VI</u>	Patrick Guinan, Chief Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, LCB	Selection of Boards, Commissions, and Similar Entities for Review During the 2023–2024 Interim

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm>.