

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 13, 2024  
MEETING OF THE  
INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE

Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno called a special meeting of the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to order at 1:36 p.m. on March 13, 2024, in Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair  
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Vice Chair  
Senator Nicole Cannizzaro  
Senator Pete Goicoechea  
Senator Dallas Harris  
Senator Dina Neal  
Senator Rochelle Nguyen  
Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert  
Senator Robin Titus  
Assemblywoman Natha Anderson  
Assemblywoman Shea Backus  
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May  
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman  
Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow  
Assemblyman Gregory Hafen II  
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui  
Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama  
Assemblywoman Erica Mosca  
Assemblyman Philip P.K. O'Neill  
Assemblyman Howard Watts  
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Assemblywoman Sarah Peters

**LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:**

Brenda Erdoes, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau  
Sarah Coffman, Fiscal Analyst, Assembly  
Wayne Thorley, Fiscal Analyst, Senate  
Brody Leiser, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Cathy Crocket, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Karen Hoppe, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Julie Waller, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Asher Killian, Legislative Counsel  
Eileen O'Grady, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel  
Jessica Dummer, Deputy Legislative Counsel  
Melissa Garvin, Fiscal Analysis Division Secretary

**EXHIBITS:**

[Exhibit A](#): Meeting Packet – Volume I

[Exhibit B](#): Agenda Item C.1 – ARPA CSFRF Funding Obligations

[Exhibit C](#): Agenda Item C.2 – GFO SLFRF

**A. ROLL CALL.**

MELISSA GARVIN (Secretary, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau [LCB]), called the roll. All members were present except Assemblywoman Peters, who was excused.

**B. PUBLIC COMMENT.**

DOUG UNGER (Nevada Faculty Alliance):

Faculty, staff, and students no longer feel safe after the December 6, 2023, mass shooting on the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) campus. The campus is still grieving the murders of three beloved teachers, all of whom were minority professors, and a visiting professor who was wounded. In the aftermath of the shooting, UNLV has been addressing support for a traumatized community's mental health and well-being first, followed by improving safety and security so that students and faculty will feel secure. To that end, UNLV is formulating short-term, mid-term, and long-term plans. Among the most immediate measures Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) leaders have implemented is increased security staffing, which is some small comfort to most of us, though by no means all of us. The \$2.6 million requested for NSHE from American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds in Agenda Item D.25 is a start to fund this additional staffing. Soon, far more will be asked of the state for infrastructure and other improvements, with some amount of urgency.

As long as the culture continues to sacrifice humane values to the cult of the gun, as long as society makes it normative to address grievances with guns, as long as the body politic tolerates gun violence like a disease it is unwilling to cure, it is our responsibility to take every action possible to protect the lives of students and those who teach them. NSHE is hard at work on effective practical proposals for safety and security improvements which will make the most careful use of these urgently needed funds.

Thank you for voting to approve, and for your service to the state.

**C. AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT, CORONAVIRUS STATE FISCAL RECOVERY FUNDS.**

1. Statement of American Rescue Plan Act, Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Fund obligations and remaining unobligated balance.

BRODY LEISER (Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, LCB):

I will discuss Agenda Item C.1, the Statement of the ARPA Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Fund obligations and remaining unobligated balance.

The table ([Exhibit B](#)) is not included in the meeting packet. Members should have a hard copy; the document is also available on the Committee webpage (<https://www.leg.state.nv.us/>).

At the top of page 1 is a high-level summary displaying expenditures for FY 2022 and FY 2023 ([Exhibit B](#)), the amounts currently authorized, inclusive of the requests before the Committee today, and the remaining unobligated balance. If all requests submitted for consideration today are approved, approximately \$47.8 million would remain unobligated. As a reminder, the funds must be obligated by December 31, 2024, and expended by December 31, 2026.

There were several revisions to existing rows on the table following the February 8, 2024, IFC meeting; those are identified in red text in the *Notes* column on the far right of the table ([Exhibit B](#)). These revisions were made to update identified savings amounts as confirmed with the Governor's Finance Office (GFO), as well as making minor adjustments to actual FY 2023 expenditures for certain programs based on reconciliation information provided by the Department of Agriculture. As a reminder, the table generally lists program descriptions and amounts in chronological order based on the approval date. The items submitted for consideration by the Committee today begin on page 24 of the table ([Exhibit B](#)).

Under Agenda Item D, there are 19 requests to deobligate funding facilitated through 21 work programs. These items are listed on rows 251 through 269 on pages 24 and 25 of the table ([Exhibit B](#)), and if approved, would deobligate \$23.8 million of previously approved authority. There are 6 items that will have revisions requested to ensure that project tracking is in alignment with the state budget authority. The revised amounts are reflected on the table and are noted in red text. In addition to those deobligation requests, there are 4 requests for new funding allocations facilitated through 6 work programs under Agenda Item D and the action item under Agenda Item E, as shown on rows 270 to 273 on page 25 of the table ([Exhibit B](#)). If approved, those 4 requests would allocate a total of \$4.1 million to support a CIP (Capital Improvement Program) project at the Stewart Campus; an affordable housing study; a camera system upgrade for two Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) facilities; and contracted security for NSHE. The Committee will have an opportunity to hear each of these items and receive additional details about the requests.

The table lists program descriptions in chronological order based on the approval date ([Exhibit B](#)). All requested items for consideration today are grouped together at the end of the table; therefore, the deobligation work programs listed on rows 251 through 269 are associated with an existing row higher up on the table. As indicated in the *Notes* column, if these deobligation requests are approved, the reduction will be shown on the row containing the initial approval of the program on future statements presented to this body. Understanding that it would be helpful to see this information together now, a section was added to the statement starting on page 26 to include a table that summarizes all the deobligation work program requests so the reduction can be seen alongside the originally approved amount.

On page 26 of the handout, there is a new section of the statement that was added for this meeting ([Exhibit B](#)) that is a summary of the requests to deobligate authority of previously approved programs. I will briefly walk the Committee through the format of the table. Moving from left to right in the columns, the far-left column will note the agenda item associated with the requests before the Committee today. The next column will identify when these programs were originally approved, some of which go back as early as April 2022 for their initial approval. That column also references the row on the statement with which these deobligations are associated.

The description column is the description that mirrors the original program description from the earlier section of the table. Then it shows the originally approved allocation, and the FY 2023 actual expenditures, if any, for these programs. If there have been any savings or deobligations that have already been approved, those are reflected in the column titled: *Approved Savings/Deobligation*. There is a column to show the current remaining authority. The next column, titled: *Deobligation Request at March 13, 2024, IFC*, is the amount associated with the work program or work programs as revised, that are being requested to have the authority removed from the budget.

On the far right is the *Notes and Project Reduction Reason* column that includes additional information, either about the request today and/or if prior adjustments have been made, as well as the reason provided for the reduction. That information comes from the work program material submitted by the agencies and the GFO, and/or based on information that was received from the state agencies. This additional section was provided in a separate table so Committee members, as well as those watching the meeting, can see the entire picture for the deobligation requests compared to the amounts as originally approved.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KASAMA:

Thank you for adding the deobligation work program summary. In the first row, which contains the program summary, funding for the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) has a current remaining authority of \$1.5 million and a deobligation of \$1.3 million. Does that mean there is \$200,000 left from the original authorization that can be used?

MR. LEISER:

That is correct. For that particular program, the \$200,000 was expended on planning efforts that had gotten underway and were required to be paid.

There was no further discussion on this item.

2. Status report on the administration, obligation and expenditure of American Rescue Plan Act, Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds (Letter of Intent, 82<sup>nd</sup> [2023] Legislative Session).

AMY STEPHENSON (Director, GFO):

The master spreadsheet provided at every meeting of the IFC is being updated for actual expenses and will be ready for the April 11, 2024, IFC meeting. The table before the Committee today ([Exhibit C](#)) is a summary of the \$23.0 million in deobligations and \$4.1 million in new requests Mr. Leiser mentioned in his presentation. The numbers on the left side of the table coincide with Mr. Leiser's spreadsheet for easy cross-referencing; line 49 on the GFO's table is the same as line 49 on the Fiscal Division's table.

SENATOR NEAL:

Has the GFO ensured that all budgeted allocations of the ARPA funds will meet the federally obligated deadline of December 31, 2024?

MS. STEPHENSON:

Yes. The GFO has ensured that all budgeted allocations are either in contract or have been subgranted to meet the federally obligated deadline.

There was no further discussion on this item.

**D. APPROVAL OF WORK PROGRAM REVISIONS FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT, CORONAVIRUS STATE FISCAL RECOVERY FUNDS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH NRS 353.220(5)(b) - REQUIRES EXPEDITIOUS ACTION WITHIN 15 DAYS.**

**1. Office of the Governor - COVID-19 Relief Programs - FY 2024**

Transfer of \$2,626,486 from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Projects category, \$250,000 from the ARPA State Agency Allocations category, \$877,731 from the ARPA Childrens Mental Health category, \$3,624,276 from the ARPA Public Health category, and \$4,067,033 from the ARPA Services for Specific Populations category to the Loss Revenue Reserve category to deobligate previously approved funding authority. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount transferred from the ARPA Services for Specific Populations exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEMS D.2, D.3, D.4, D.5, D.6, D.7, D.8, D.9, D.10, D.11, D.12, D.13, D.14, D.15, D.16, D.17, D.18, and D.19. Work Program #24FR132716. RECEIVED 3-1-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**2. Department of Health and Human Services - Public and Behavioral Health - Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$1,302,785 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate funds for the renovation project at the City of Las Vegas detention center since the project has been terminated. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the ARPA Forensic Las Vegas Jail Renovation category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF31613. RECEIVED 2-27-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**3. Department of Health and Human Services - Public and Behavioral Health - Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$4,795,745 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate funds for Stein Forensic Hospital renovations due to the completion of the project. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the ARPA Stein Renovation category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF31616. RECEIVED 2-28-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**4. Department of Health and Human Services - Aging and Disability Services - Planning, Advocacy and Community Grants - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$1,788,960 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate funds for the Mobile Respite Program. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the ARPA Planning Advocacy Community Unit Activities category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF32782. RECEIVED 2-29-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**5. Department of Health and Human Services - Aging and Disability Services - Planning, Advocacy and Community Grants - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$400,000 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate funds for the Home-Delivered Meals for Older Adults project. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the ARPA Planning Advocacy Community Unit Activities category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF32783. RECEIVED 2-29-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**6. Department of Health and Human Services - Aging and Disability Services - Planning, Advocacy and Community Grants - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$2,000,000 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate funds for the Personal Care Workforce Impact project. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the ARPA Planning Advocacy Community Unit Activities category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF32784. RECEIVED 2-29-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**7. Department of Health and Human Services - Aging and Disability Services - Planning, Advocacy and Community Grants - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$500,000 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate funds for the Resource and Service Navigation project. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the ARPA Planning Advocacy and Community Unit Activities category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF32785. RECEIVED 2-28-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**8. Department of Health and Human Services - Child and Family Services - Northern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$162,013 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account with an equal reduction to the Personnel category due to staff vacancies. Requires Interim Finance approval since the cumulative amount deleted from the Personnel category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF32813. RECEIVED 2-27-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**9. Department of Health and Human Services - Child and Family Services - Northern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$736,487 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account with an equal reduction to the Personnel category due to staff vacancies. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the Personnel category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF32814. RECEIVED 2-27-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**10. Department of Health and Human Services - Child and Family Services - Northern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$248,239 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account with an equal reduction to the Personnel category due to staff vacancies. Requires Interim Finance approval since the cumulative amount deleted from the Personnel category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF32815. RECEIVED 2-27-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**11. Department of Health and Human Services - Public and Behavioral Health - Lake's Crossing Center - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$660,000 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate unspent salaries for the Lake's Crossing outpatient services program due to recruitment difficulties. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the ARPA Professional Services category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF36453. RECEIVED 2-27-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.



**12. Department of Health and Human Services - Child and Family Services - Southern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$105,394 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account with an equal reduction to the Personnel category due to staff vacancies. Requires Interim Finance approval since the cumulative amount deleted from the Personnel category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF36464. RECEIVED 2-27-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**13. Department of Health and Human Services - Child and Family Services - Southern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$238,801 of federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account with an equal reduction to the Personnel category due to staff vacancies. Requires Interim Finance approval since the cumulative amount deleted from the Personnel category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF36465. RECEIVED 2-28-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**14. Department of Health and Human Services - Child and Family Services - Southern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$362,085 of federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account with an equal reduction to the Personnel category due to staff vacancies. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the Personnel category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FRF36466. RECEIVED 2-8-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**15. Department of Health and Human Services - Health Care Financing and Policy - Health Care Financing and Policy Administration - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$250,000 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate funds for the study on the return on investment for targeted wage increases for state employees enrolled in Medicaid. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the ARPA Studies Professional Services category exceeds 20% of the legislatively approved amount for that category. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FR315807. RECEIVED 2-28-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**16. Department of Health and Human Services - Public and Behavioral Health - Crisis Response - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$1,956,000 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds (FRF) transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate funds for the Nevada Resilience Project. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the ARPA-FRF NV Resilience Program category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FR316501. RECEIVED 2-28-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**17. Department of Health and Human Services - Public and Behavioral Health - Crisis Response - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$4,799,969 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds (FRF) transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate funds for the Crisis Stabilization Centers project. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the ARPA-FRF Crisis Stabilization Centers category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FR316502. RECEIVED 2-28-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**18. Department of Health and Human Services - Public and Behavioral Health - Behavioral Health Prevention and Treatment - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$964,276 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate funds for the Newborn Opioid Screening Panel. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the ARPA Newborn Opioid Screening category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FR317011. RECEIVED 2-28-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**19. Department of Health and Human Services - Health Care Financing and Policy - Nevada Medicaid, Title XIX - FY 2024**

Deletion of \$2,226,486 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate funds for the Long-Term Care Funding for Assisted Living and Nursing Facility Workforce project. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the Long-Term Workforce-ARPA category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.1. Work Program #24FR324301. RECEIVED 2-29-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**20. Office of the Governor - COVID-19 Relief Programs - FY 2025**

Transfer of \$420,086 from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) State Agency Allocations category to the Loss Revenue Reserve category to deobligate previously approved funding authority. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount transferred from the ARPA State Agency Allocations category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.21. Work Program #25FR132705. RECEIVED 3-1-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.21.

**21. Department of Health and Human Services - Public and Behavioral Health - Office of Health Administration - FY 2025**

Deletion of \$420,086 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to deobligate projected unspent salaries for state full-time equivalent positions due to vacancies. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount deleted from the Personnel category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.20. Work Program #25FR322301. RECEIVED 2-28-24.**

Agenda Items D.1 through D.21 were discussed jointly.

AMY STEPHENSON (Director, GFO):

Agenda Item D.1 was revised; the updated numbers are as follows: "Transfer of \$9,378,231 from the ARPA Projects category, \$250,000 from the ARPA State Agency Allocations category, \$4,799,969 from the ARPA Crisis Care category, \$8,666,753 from the ARPA Children's Mental Health category, \$3,624,276 from the ARPA Public Health category, and \$4,562,177 from the ARPA Specific Population category," which totals the \$23,481,406 transferred to the Loss Revenue Reserve category to deobligate previously approved funding authority.

CHAIR MONROE-MORENO:

Would you please repeat the revision for Category 31 [ARPA Children's Mental Health]?

MS. STEPHENSON:

The revised amount for Category 31 is \$866,753.

SENATOR NGUYEN:

Please clarify the difference compared to the original total, or was the total just allocated differently?

MS. STEPHENSON:

The revision was a reallocation as well as to ensure the funds are taken from the correct categories and reverted to the Loss Revenue Reserve category.

SENATOR NEAL:

How much funding and how many of the projects have been approved through the budget process that have not yet met the federal obligation requirement as a result of the pending contract approvals or for other reasons?

MS. STEPHENSON:

The items that have not met the requirements are the items before the Committee today. Additional items will be brought to the April 11, 2024, and June 13, 2024, IFC meetings. I am uncertain of the total number of projects, but approximately another \$9.0 million for the April 11, 2024, IFC meeting.

SENATOR NEAL:

In the list, there is a mobile crisis team in Washoe County whose money is being reduced. Are there talks about transferring some of that money to the Clark County mobile crisis team where there is a larger population and more need for response on the street?

MS. STEPHENSON:

That would be a question for the agency. I do not know if the agency has discussed that as an option, but I would be happy to provide that information to the Committee.

MARLA MCDADE WILLIAMS (Division Administrator, DCFS, DHHS):

The DCFS currently administers the mobile crisis response teams in both Clark and Washoe Counties. The deobligations are due to the salary component; under the new guidelines where the agency was unable to hire staff within the appropriate timeframe, the agency had to deobligate those funds. The deobligation applies to both Clark and Washoe Counties.

SENATOR NEAL:

Is the money only to be used for salaries, not for the program?

MS. MCDADE WILLIAMS:

The program is all salaries; individual salaried positions respond to crises directly.

SENATOR NEAL:

Clark County was unable to fill any additional positions in the county?

MS. MCDADE WILLIAMS:

That is correct. The agency has challenges hiring within the state system. The new guidelines do not allow the agency to use positions that were funded as state positions after December 2024. If the agency is unable to fill those positions by the deadline, there is no opportunity to redirect the money toward something else in the same program, regardless of the county. Both counties were in the same position at some point, where the hiring processes and lack of applicants prevented the agency from being able to fill the positions and meet the timelines.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

Senator Neal just asked about the crisis stabilization centers. Were those answers related to Agenda Item D.17 or another item?

Ms. McDADE WILLIAMS:

I am uncertain whether the question was related to a specific agenda item.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

It is disheartening to see that much of the deobligation is coming from the DHHS, given the needs in the community. This is one of the reasons the Legislature makes a concerted effort to allocate money to nonprofits in the community, to supplement the work that state agencies cannot do, either due to capacity or hiring.

Agenda Item D.17 stood out as a substantial reduction because the initial allocation for that program was \$20.0 million, and the deobligation amount is \$5.0 million, which is 25% of the program. I thought the deobligation was because crisis intervention centers could not be established in the rural communities. Is the \$5.0 million that is being deobligated for salaries, or structural or procedural challenges in establishing programs?

CODY PHINNEY (Division Administrator, Division of Public and Behavioral Health [DPBH], DHHS):

Agenda Item D.17 is a request from the DPBH. The reason for the deobligation is that staff has been working with several agencies to establish crisis stabilization centers but have been unable to do so. In the original proposal for \$20.0 million, the agency set aside \$5.0 million specific to rural services. The organization working with the DPBH on rural crisis stabilization identified it had other needs to put in place before it could establish more crisis stabilization services. There is, however, one rural crisis stabilization center currently in operation. The agency wants to deobligate the \$5.0 million for the specific purposes of a crisis stabilization center, because of the design in funding, so the money can potentially be used in the necessary timeframe for another mental health service. The agency continues to work on supporting the establishment of crisis stabilization in the Reno and Las Vegas areas.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

Discussions about crisis stabilization have been ongoing for a decade. It is a particular issue in the rural communities in terms of the resources it takes to transport people from rural communities to forensic hospitals, as forensic hospitals are generally in urban areas. One of the motivations for establishing crisis stabilization services in the rural areas is to prevent taking from law enforcement and transport service resources. It sounds like the DPBH is still doing work in Clark and Washoe Counties. I understand the agency is deobligating the \$5.0 million because the state wants to ensure the funds do not revert back to the

federal government. Is there still a plan in place to address crisis stabilization in the rural communities? It sounded like there was a vendor that wanted some of the groundwork laid first. Is that still in process, or is it back to the beginning in the rural communities?

MS. PHINNEY:

This funding was specific to the crisis stabilization center, which in its current form needs to be associated with a hospital. The agency will continue working to establish crisis stabilization centers wherever there is a need. The issue of transportation to psychiatric facilities, which is sometimes handled by law enforcement, was not addressed by the crisis stabilization center project; however, the agency continues to work on projects for transportation of individuals in need of psychiatric care.

Regarding forensic hospitals, those patients are already in the custody of law enforcement, making it different than a civil setting. The crisis stabilization center is in the civil setting. Forensic transportation is likely to remain with law enforcement.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I understand there is a difference on the criminal forensic side versus the mental health crisis side. As I understand it, the \$5.0 million being deobligated was not going to address the transportation piece. There are not enough adequate facilities in the rural communities to colocate a crisis stabilization center at a hospital or health care facility, which is the issue with this particular program as envisioned.

MS. PHINNEY:

Yes, this program was not specifically directed at transportation. The hope was that the agency could establish some centers that would limit the need for transportation; however, this program was for that capital improvement type of activity that has not come to fruition in the timeframe that this funding allows.

SENATOR NGUYEN:

There are quite a few deobligation requests before the Committee today. I know some substantial ongoing projects with long-term strategic plans are taking place between the City of Las Vegas and Clark County around these crisis stabilization centers. Do any of the deobligated funds relate to those existing programs and plans?

MS. PHINNEY:

This deobligation is particular to the piece set aside specific to the rural areas.

CHAIR MONROE-MORENO:

With the deobligated funds, if there are crisis stabilization centers under construction in Washoe and Clark Counties, adjacent or not adjacent to county hospitals like the University Medical Center (UMC), could that \$4.0 million be redirected to those crisis stabilization centers?

MS. PHINNEY:

The language the agency used in soliciting information set those funds aside specifically for the rural areas. I am currently unaware of a proposal for additional funding. The rest of the \$20.0 million is being allocated to those other areas, and I am unaware of any additional current needs. I am not aware of any rule that prohibits the \$5.0 million from being allocated in the manner described.

CHAIR MONROE-MORENO:

If not, the Committee would have to talk to the GFO about an additional work program at a future date.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS:

Beyond the requests submitted today for consideration, has the GFO identified any additional savings from previously approved Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds (CSFRF) as a result of meeting with state agencies, and when does the GFO anticipate submitting work programs to reflect those savings?

MS. STEPHENSON:

After meetings with the state agencies, the GFO has identified approximately \$9.5 million in savings, with more savings possible. The work programs are being transmitted today, which is the deadline for the April 11, 2024, IFC meeting. I am uncertain if the \$9.5 million will be coming over for the April IFC meeting or the June IFC meeting.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS:

Please discuss what projects the Governor is considering funding with the remaining unobligated CSFRF. That would include the \$9.5 million for future items plus \$23.0 million before the Committee today, and the possibility of more funds. Is there a plan in place?



MS. STEPHENSON:

Yes. The Governor submitted eight priority projects today for the April 11, 2024, IFC meeting. Some of the projects included are Office of the Military for \$850,000; Washoe County for a West Hills facility rehabilitation for \$14.5 million; Boys and Girls Club for early learning centers for \$16,765,000; Department of Corrections, High Desert State Prison culinary equipment for approximately \$1.8 million; Vitality Unlimited, to finish creating an integrated mental health and addiction treatment campus for \$3.0 million; and Opportunity Village for Betty's Village North for \$5.0 million. That totals approximately \$41.0 million.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS:

For the money going to the Boys and Girls Club for early learning, is that throughout the state or just one location?

MS. STEPHENSON:

I believe it is throughout the state. I will provide the Committee with an answer.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS:

I understand there are also revised amounts for Agenda Items D.8 through D.14. What are those revised amounts?

MS. STEPHENSON:

These amounts align with Agenda Item D.1, which is a pitcher and a catcher, and will align with the categories mentioned in Agenda Item D.1.

- Agenda Item D.8 should be revised to "Deletion of \$160,586 in federal ARPA CSFRF with an equal reduction to the Personnel category."
- Agenda Item D.9 should be revised to, "Deletion of \$733,715 with an equal reduction to the Personnel category."
- Agenda Item D.10 should be revised to, "Deletion of \$245,864 with an equal reduction to the Personnel category."
- Agenda Item D.12 should be revised to, "Deletion of \$104,443 with an equal reduction to the Personnel category."
- Agenda Item D.13 should be revised to, "Deletion of \$236,717 with an equal reduction to the Personnel category."
- Agenda Item D.14 should be revised to, "Deletion of \$355,860 with an equal reduction to the Personnel category."

SENATOR NEAL:

Is the \$3.0 million going toward mental health?

MS. STEPHENSON:

Yes, the funds will go to Vitality Unlimited to create an integrated mental health and addiction treatment campus for \$3.0 million.

SENATOR NEAL:

Will the facility be located in Washoe or Clark County?

MS. STEPHENSON:

It will be in Carson City.

SENATOR NEAL:

How many people will be impacted by this facility in Carson City?

MS. STEPHENSON:

I do not have the details on those programs, but I can provide that information to the Committee.

SENATOR NEAL:

What is the Governor's plan around the mental health rollout of these dollars if the money is redistributed? Whenever mental health is discussed, homelessness comes up immediately, but what is the global plan for impacting the mental health space? Addiction, crisis, mobile team needs, and homelessness are part of the broader umbrella under which those services usually reside. When the GFO returns for the April 11, 2024, IFC meeting, will there be work programs that will impact mental health in the state? I do not understand how these programs are helping with the global need in the state.

MS. STEPHENSON:

I can send the Committee the plan showing the impact. Currently, all the projects are being aligned to the Governor's three-year policy matrix, and mental health is in the matrix under health and wellness.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

How did the overestimation of funds occur? I am thinking about the programs the Legislature allocated money to during the 82<sup>nd</sup> (2023) Legislative Session; there were people who could have used the money but did not receive anything. Will the funds from programs in Southern Nevada be reallocated to other programs in Southern Nevada, and the same for Northern Nevada? I hope the deobligated funds are not stockpiled in one area and instead, the money is allocated throughout the state. There are more people living in Southern Nevada, so the services may be in need at a different level.

MS. STEPHENSON:

Currently, all projects coming in for possible deobligation are being vetted to make sure they meet the federal requirements for obligation, adhere to the ARPA rules, and align with the Governor's strategic plans, after which the Governor's Office is prioritizing the projects.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

I understand the difficulty in finding vendors and hiring staff; it is unfortunate that should cause these reductions. I also understand that sometimes programs get cut due to tight timelines for the obligation and expenditure of funds. While some projects are being reduced, others, such as the mobile respite program and the Nevada Resilience project, are being completely deobligated. Over \$20.0 million in health care, including significant investments toward mental and behavioral health, is being deobligated. I am concerned that although the GFO plans to reobligate the money, not all the money will necessarily go into health care or mental health with a statewide scope. It makes sense for these programs to be deobligated, but I hope when some of that funding is reconsolidated, it will be invested in programs that can be successful, or if not, that at least some of the money will go toward critical needs instead of potentially moving the funds to other areas.

Ms. Stephenson, you noted that mental health is one of the focus areas for the Governor; what is the plan for additional investments or reinvestments of this funding into health care and behavioral health programs? Are the facilities in Washoe and Clark Counties all that the DHHS currently has planned?

MS. STEPHENSON:

I will defer to the DHHS team to answer that question.

RICHARD WHITLEY (Director, DHHS):

The DHHS partnered with Washoe County years ago to address homelessness issues by focusing on priority populations such as adolescents, pregnant women, and families. The department has been successful in partnering with Washoe County to provide housing, services, and a pathway to more permanent, independent living by addressing underlying mental health and substance abuse issues for those populations.

One of the ARPA projects from the DHHS was a master plan for the Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services campus on Charleston Boulevard; that is the product of the funding. The division continues to work with the stakeholders in Clark County to actualize that plan. I can provide a report to the Committee showing the most recent updates. The DHHS is in different phases of the plan in different parts of the state. The department is working hard with critical access hospitals in the rural areas to build off existing infrastructure. Carson Tahoe Regional Medical Center serves a role to many of the rural hospitals, and it has an

acute psychiatric unit. The DHHS is working on various geographically based strategies. I will follow up with the plan so that these individual projects, which by themselves do not tell the whole picture, can be connected to the overall plan and where it stands; it might be helpful when discussing the individual projects.

The goal is to serve people with serious emotional illness or substance abuse issues at the lowest level possible in the community. The unhoused population is probably the most challenging, so the priority in Southern Nevada is to look for transitional living and temporary residential housing as a vehicle to stability, then move on to more long-term housing and employment. Tackling populations such as the elderly, pregnant women, and adolescents are populations that the DHHS has quantified, and in many ways, as was experienced in Northern Nevada, are winnable battles when broken down, and when looking at the challenges. It is a complicated question and requires a complicated response. Geographically, the needs are different because communities are at different places with their capacity.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

A follow up will not be necessary; however, I would like to see that plan. My bottom line is that state resources should continue to be dedicated toward advancing and actualizing that plan. I want to ensure that continues throughout the 2023-24 Interim as the state works to manage and ensure that all the ARPA funds are obligated and spent.

SENATOR NEAL:

Is the Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services campus project included in the \$100.0 million that was dedicated by the Legislature?

MR. WHITLEY:

It certainly could be part of that funding. Discussions are ongoing with the stakeholders looking to maximize that opportunity. I would be more comfortable providing a follow up with the plan, but that project is included. The DHHS is trying to avoid missing any opportunities, and it is all hinged on the master plan, paid for with ARPA funds for the campus to serve these populations. That master plan is still relevant today.

Yes, the DHHS is engaging, but it has not landed in terms of contracts; the department is still in the planning stages. When it comes to health care services, the DHHS is being deliberate so there is not a service cliff where everything abruptly stops. The department is working on a timeline with Medicaid to ensure that when some of these services in the community need a waiver or some action on Medicaid's part for reimbursement, it is synced up so that as the services are stood up, they can also be sustained. It is anchored to that plan that was invested in by the state.

It is best looked at geographically with the overall goal that no pregnant woman, adolescent, or elderly person with health conditions should be unhoused. The DHHS is starting with those populations because the service needs are apparent. They are populations in which the department could intervene. If I could pull together the master plan, it would be informative for Southern Nevada.

In the rural areas, the DHHS has to be strategic and work with partners. Some of the rural access hospitals identify a mental health need, but no one has responded to the DHHS request for proposal with interest in establishing a crisis stabilization center attached to their hospital, other than Carson Tahoe Regional Medical Center.

CHAIR MONROE-MORENO:

It is known, collectively, that there is an ongoing health care crisis in Nevada, especially relating to mental health. These dollars, going back to April 2022, were allocated to address that crisis. However, staffing for state employees has also been a crisis in the state, which is why the Legislature made a point to ensure adequate compensation for state employees; to put employees in a better place than they were before the 82<sup>nd</sup> (2023) Legislative Session, and to make hiring easier, but that will not happen overnight.

As the DHHS moves forward and develops a master plan, I am eager to see the plan to ensure these dollars will go to the intended programs and to areas of the state where the need is greatest. Although there is a need everywhere in the state, some areas have a greater need. I look forward to seeing those work programs and where the funds will be reobligated, because the need is ongoing.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEMS D.1 THROUGH D.21 AS REVISED.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THE MEMBERS PRESENT.

**22. Office of the Governor - COVID-19 Relief Programs - FY 2024**

Transfer of \$521,653 from the Loss Revenue Reserve category to the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) State Agency Allocations category to support an allocation to the Department of Administration, State Public Works Division for a scope increase for CIP Project 19-C16, Renovation of Collections Storage Building 19, Stewart Campus. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount transferred to the ARPA State Agency Allocations category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM E. Work Program #24FR132714. RECEIVED 2-28-24.**

Agenda Item D.22 and Agenda Item E were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item E.

**23. Office of the Governor - COVID-19 Relief Programs - FY 2024**

Transfer of \$150,000 from the Loss Revenue Reserve category to the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Projects category to provide a subaward to the Guinn Center to conduct a statewide study on affordable housing in Nevada. Requires Interim Finance approval since the cumulative amount transferred to the ARPA Projects category exceeds \$350,000. **Work Program #24FR132715. RECEIVED 2-28-24.**

MICHAEL STEWART (Research Director, Kenny C. Guinn Center for Policy Priorities):

The Kenny C. Guinn Center for Policy Priorities (Guinn Center) is requesting \$150,000 for a housing study.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

Would the findings of the Guinn Center's study on affordable housing be completed and available prior to the beginning of the 83<sup>rd</sup> (2025) Legislative Session? There have been multiple studies over the years where nothing appears to be done with the results. I hesitate to give money for one more study and not do anything with the results. Would the recommendations provided in the study be incorporated into The Executive Budget for the 2025-27 Biennium?

MEREDITH LEVINE (Director of Economic and Fiscal Policy, Kenny C. Guinn Center for Policy Priorities):

Yes, that is the intent. This project has a completion date of October 31, 2024. The idea is timeliness and relevance. The Guinn Center is aware there are many studies; however, the Guinn Center's goal is to provide a menu of policy solutions that are formulated and evidence-based that will be useful to the Committee and others moving into the 83<sup>rd</sup> (2025) Legislative Session.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

I will be at a loss for words if I see one more housing study upon which no action is taken.

SENATOR NEAL:

In the study, will the Guinn Center take into account the Southern Nevada Regional Transportation Study and Southern Nevada Strong? There is a direct correlation between housing patterns and transportation. Will the study be multimodal? Southern Nevada has density in the center, but it thins out on the outer edges. Will the study also consider housing other than single-family homes, such as townhomes, due to limited space and limited water? I am curious about the other factors that will be intersecting with this study.

MS. LEVINE:

There is an intersection of many facets in this study, including housing, health, and education. As a result of the timeline and scope, the Guinn Center cannot address every issue, but because of the particular intersections, it is important to take those factors into account. There are various housing options; if I started to outline them now, there would be no need for a study. Part of the justification is to look at the most innovative solutions that tackle the thornier challenges.

SENATOR NEAL:

Will the study look at how planning commissions move as well as zoning regulations because they have a significant influence in how the state builds and moves forward, and whether that trajectory will change? The planning agencies, whether it is at the city or county level, are at the front line deciding how the state builds and also the stakeholders that are on the outside.

MS. LEVINE:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

The work program mentions that part of the process is meeting with stakeholders. Who will be part of what this study is working toward?

MS. LEVINE:

Everybody who would have a stake in housing will be part of this study, which could mean the community at large. The Guinn Center does not want to be too narrow and say exactly who will be involved, but the Guinn Center is talking to housing authorities, local governments, state government, the housing coalition, and the Nevada Housing Division. The Guinn Center will be soliciting input to inform that stakeholder list because community input is important, including indigenous tribal communities, disadvantaged communities, etc. The Guinn Center wants to cast the net and hear from all voices affected by housing, which is a lot of people in Nevada, and that is why this study is important.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

Part of the Committee's struggle with this request is that there are already many housing studies. There is a lot of information, including annual reports provided by Washoe and Clark Counties, and studies by the Legislature. The study that correlates the most is from the 79<sup>th</sup> (2017) Legislative Session and the corresponding 2018 report. The recommendations included in that report were adopted by the Legislature and those bills were passed and signed into law.

Not only are there prior legislative studies, but there are also ongoing studies by the Guinn Center, studies being brought forward by local governments, subcommittees on issues from homelessness to housing, as well as regular reports by the Nevada Housing Division.

I struggle to understand what is in this report that is not already being done by universities, local governments, the housing authority, the federal government, and previous studies by the Guinn Center and the Legislature. It is as though the state is looking for other solutions to a problem that it knows exists because it does not like the original recommendations.

MS. LEVINE:

I do not disagree with that point. There are many studies, solutions, formulations, and policy options. The Guinn Center is not trying to be duplicative, but at the same time, there may be some tried-and-true solutions in previous studies. The Guinn Center is trying to identify the most evidence-based solutions that have had the most impact in other jurisdictions where there have been real, demonstrable outcomes. There have been reports that show this, but performing a nationwide scan and winnowing down actionable options can have an impact on moving this forward into the 83<sup>rd</sup> (2025) Legislative Session.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

Is the Guinn Center's position that all the other studies from the Nevada Housing Division, the Guinn Center, Washoe and Clark Counties, various municipalities, and the federal government, do not take into account what is happening across the United States, and therefore, that is the missing piece?

MS. LEVINE:

Many of those studies do take that into account. The piece that is missing is combining that information in one place and showing optimal impact, then looking at how that information intersects with existing laws and regulations to see how it can be customized and moved forward.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

The cost of housing, rental increases, and the unavailability of houses that can be purchased by individual buyers for a whole host of reasons, is no surprise to any of the members of this Committee who have talked to their constituents. The issues and barriers to obtaining housing is evident, including homelessness and some of the causes thereof. The state has invested a lot of money into affordable housing.

At every meeting of the IFC, the Committee receives a report on different investments that have been made in affordable housing units. I do not discount that there should be ongoing discussions about how to make housing more affordable, but the state has experienced these issues in the past. There were



multiple bills during the 80<sup>th</sup> (2019) Legislative Session from the prior study; those bills were all passed by the Legislature and signed into law to deal with many of these issues. There was legislation during the 82<sup>nd</sup> (2023) Legislative Session that addressed issues such as how to help people keep their houses, how to ensure there are more houses available for individual buyers as opposed to corporate buyers, and how to ensure that issues of rental availability and stability can be addressed. I think some people just dislike those answers.

I recognize it may be useful to combine these different pieces into one place, but it is frustrating to talk about a study for a problem for which many of the answers are already known. I sincerely hope that what comes of this study is not just trying to find alternative solutions to the solutions already proposed, because Nevadans who cannot afford housing need policy solutions.

MS. LEVINE:

I hear your concerns and understand your frustration. There is certainly a lot of discussion around housing. I want to reassure you that some of those tried-and-true solutions, the ones that break the logjam, those solutions likely could be identified in the study as a reinforcement of a path forward because the crisis is persistent. I acknowledge that this will be yet another study; however, it will allow previous options to be reconsidered and evaluated for their effectiveness and efficacy. The study will also consider some novel solutions that may be complementary. That is what the Guinn Center hopes to offer through this study and that the Legislature will take under advisement.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

I appreciate this discussion. The Legislature is always looking for different types of funds and it seems like this is something that may need to be chased. Many times, there are federal programs. Will part of this study be around the different buckets of funds that may be available that have not yet been identified? I know the state is always looking for solutions, but it also has to be able to find the money to implement those solutions; sometimes the money gets rolled out piecemeal, and the agencies have to know to apply for those grants. Will the Guinn Center also be looking at sources of funds for any programs chosen for development?

MS. LEVINE:

Absolutely. Part of this study is about the various funds. Discussions can center around different interventions from a regulatory and/or a statutory standpoint, but Nevada could be improving its pathways to federal dollars, and great work has been seen in that area. To the extent practicable, those dollars can be brought into Nevada, and that is what can make a difference and have the biggest return on investment. There are different ways to approach housing, such as tax credit programs, including property tax. The Guinn Center wants to be as inclusive as possible to the various methods of approaching the housing crisis.

SENATOR SEEVERS-GANSERT:

Money is often the issue, and it is a moving and evolving target. I appreciate the work the Guinn Center has done on other types of issues in Nevada.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI:

Senator Cannizzaro is correct, many studies are going on throughout the state. The Nevada Housing Division collects information annually about the need for affordable housing throughout the state. The Legislature passed Assembly Bill (A.B.) 213 during the 82<sup>nd</sup> (2023) Legislative Session, requiring the cities and counties to start collecting information on the need for housing at all levels, and those reports are available. Nevada has invested \$500.0 million in affordable housing. I would like the Nevada Housing Division to come to the testifying table so I can ask about the information the Housing Division collects on an annual basis and whether that is adequate or if there is a need for another report. Additionally, is the Guinn Center working in conjunction with local governments, as they will be collecting information as well?

CHRISTINE HESS (Chief Financial Officer, Nevada Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry):

The Nevada Housing Division issues the *Annual Housing Progress Report* (AHPR). The timing of the report is a little different this year because A.B. 213 adjusted the timing so the report coincides with the fiscal year. The AHPR is amazing; however, the report is specific to subsidized housing—housing that has income restrictions.

It is a very thorough report with ample information, but it is limited in scope. The local jurisdictions provide information to the division around their affordable housing progress and what is being done in that space, but that is limited to housing that has income restrictions. The division will also be collecting and compiling information and providing some analysis as a result of A.B. 213, which goes beyond that in terms of requiring the jurisdictions to provide information about their housing that is not just subsidized, but also their housing plans over the next five years, and measures being taken to promote those plans. Assembly Bill 213 also requires local jurisdictions to prioritize affordable housing, so there is a lot of opportunity for follow up. That process is being led by the division's Economist, which is currently a vacant position; however, the division will be contracting with its former Economist, Betsy Fadali, who can help guide that process. In addition, the division will either hire or contract that position before the report is due.

The second report is a new report, and per A.B. 213, the division is only required to compile the report. The local governments are working on that report and doing an amazing job. I know it was a difficult mandate per the legislation for the local governments, but they also already have this information. In the first meetings with the local governments, the division learned that local governments are working together regionally. The north is different than the south, so it is important that local governments work together by region. Additionally, it is important to note that both the AHPR and the new report do not take into account the rural areas, which have their own challenges and needs and are also experiencing a housing affordability crisis.

I welcome the opportunity to understand additional solutions by having the Guinn Center looking at that; I do not think the division has that information in just a single report at this time.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI:

You mentioned the AHPR the division publishes has income restrictions and only covers affordable housing; that is the point I was trying to make. The request before the Committee is for money to fund a statewide study on affordable housing, not all housing. It appears to be duplicative, and I think it is missing the mark. The Guinn Center will be collecting information on something the Nevada Housing Division already provides.

MS. HESS:

I do not have that information so that would be a question for the Guinn Center. As far as affordable housing, I do not know if the Guinn Center's report is specific to housing that is subsidized, or if the Guinn Center is looking at the word affordable more broadly. In statute, affordable is defined in three tiers. Tier one is below 60% of area median income, which is the space in which the Nevada Housing Division primarily functions. Tier two is 60% to 80% of area median income, and the division functions only minorly in that space. Tier three is 80% to 120% of area median income; in terms of inventory, the division is not functioning in that space, though it does support down payment assistance that can help homeowners. I am not sure about the details of the Guinn Center's report.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI:

I would like more specifics on what the Guinn Center will be studying.

MS. LEVINE:

The Guinn Center is looking at the more broadly construed understanding of affordability, which includes workforce housing, etc. Unfortunately, it is one of those terms that has become a catch-all used colloquially. Because it has that understanding, the Guinn Center used it here, but it is fair to say that the Guinn Center is looking across the distribution in terms of how to break some of the supply and demand logjams that were seen from the 2017-18 Interim findings report, and start to make housing affordable for all Nevadans, which might in turn, reduce housing prices in different brackets.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI:

To confirm, the Guinn Center's report is focused on affordability in housing, not the traditional definition of affordable housing to which the Committee is accustomed.

MS. LEVINE:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR NEAL:

I believe Clark County has a white paper on workforce housing because it is currently moving in that space. How will that be integrated into the Guinn Center's efforts to avoid duplicating existing efforts?

MS. LEVINE:

I need to familiarize myself with that report before I can answer that question. I am happy to circle back with the Committee. I would note that the Guinn Center's study will be a statewide study; therefore, to the extent that the white paper is at the county level, it is something the Guinn Center would want to adapt to the broader state as a whole.

SENATOR NEAL:

Clark County is building workforce housing in North Las Vegas. Dagny Stapleton, who came from the Nevada Association of Counties, is working on housing. Maybe a conversation is needed to determine how the county decided to build workforce housing and the related obstacles, because it would play into that study.

Will the study discuss mitigating corporate activity that is occurring within the housing space, such as hedge funds and corporations that have recently purchased more than 234 housing units? There were bills in the 82<sup>nd</sup> (2023) Legislative Session aimed at limiting aggregate purchases and corporate activity. That activity is part of the reason housing is spiking and changing. Is the Guinn Center going to address how to mitigate that issue and propose legislative policy solutions around some of these issues or look at vetoed policy that may or may not have changed the game?

MS. LEVINE:

That is one of the choke points that is seen in the system. That research has been seen nationwide, but particularly in many western states. Looking at that and examining what kind of opportunities might exist is part of the suite of options that would potentially be taken under advisement based on evidence revealed within the course of the study.

SENATOR NEAL:

Clark County is embarking on workforce housing in a certain area. How did the county get to this place? Was there a white paper or any preliminary study that determined the county should build workforce housing in particular?

JOANNA JACOB (Government Affairs Manager, Clark County, Nevada):

The county did not prepare a white paper. I started with Clark County in 2019, prior to the pandemic; however, I previously worked as a Regional Social Service Provider in Clark County and was aware that workforce housing was a need.

Clark County has multiple programs in progress. I have listened to this discussion with interest and am appreciative of the Guinn Center's work. The county has years of data it could share to make this study productive and fill in the gaps of what is not being done under A.B. 213. One of those data points, for example, includes four years of data in which the county mitigated fees and prioritized affordable housing projects; however, Clark County has had minimal developer interest in the county's requests for proposal. The county has some good developer partners, so that is not a criticism. Clark County is looking at some of what has been put in place to determine if the county should reassess.

Regarding workforce housing, I believe you are referring to some of the initiatives that Clark County put forward with its community housing fund. The county put \$180.0 million in ARPA funds in the community housing fund. Clark County was eligible for revenue replacement because its revenue loss exceeded what the county received in local funds. Clark County put the revenue replacement into its general fund and then funded the community housing fund, which removed some of the funding restrictions being debated today. The community housing fund is geared toward affordable housing, but the county's future plans also focus on permanent supportive housing with that fund, as well as a community lands trust, which is going to be single-family ownership, deed-restricted to keep it affordable. Workforce housing is also part of that initiative.

The project you were speaking of in North Las Vegas may be something Commissioner William McCurdy also championed. It began with a federal appropriation request, and then seeded it from there because one of the county's priorities is the sustainability of projects after utilizing one-shot funding.

Clark County did not do a white paper or a study, because as the social service provider in the state, the county knows there is tremendous need everywhere. The county looks at where land can be acquired, because that is a serious barrier to housing development, and also determines where the need is based on feedback, to try to spread it throughout the region.

SENATOR NEAL:

Is Clark County a stakeholder in the study?

MS. JACOB:

If not today, because the study is still in its infancy, I will insist that Clark County be included as a stakeholder. There was some discussion earlier about A.B. 213, and I would note that Clark County is a regional collaborator with the cities in Southern Nevada. I cannot give many details because those discussions are ongoing, but the county and cities are trying to share the costs of the study that was mandated by A.B. 213. Discussions have been ongoing with planning staff, government affairs staff, and affordable housing community development staff in all the jurisdictions. There will be a contract for that study and the costs will be shared regionally. I have a lot of interest in making sure the work is not duplicative, and that the county can work on what is already underway.

SENATOR TITUS:

I am hearing a lot of conversations about the needs in Clark County and what has already been done. What I am hearing about this study is the Guinn Center will be looking at statewide issues and concerns. In the rural areas, I hear from my constituents, especially in Douglas County, about affordable housing as well as worker housing in places like South Lake Tahoe, and how to make it work. It would be helpful to look at all the facts and issues that are statewide problems. It is not just about building affordable housing, there are transit and other issues.

One of the issues mentioned by one of my colleagues was regarding corporate investment in housing. One area that I find concerning is the amount of foreign investors that are buying property and housing, and the resulting issues from those purchases. Something I would like to see in the Guinn Center's study is the amount of land that is bought for investment by people such as Chinese investors who are not necessarily friendly to state and federal government. Hopefully, this study will look at some of the other aspects of housing and why it is not affordable. Also, will the study expand on who is actually buying the houses and who owns the land?

MS. LEVINE:

That information will be uncovered to the extent possible. As you are aware, some of this information is behind trusts and is otherwise private. There is a question around vacancy rates and investor-owned properties, so that is pushing into different areas. The Guinn Center wants to take a closer look at all the dimensions. Nothing is off the table for this study.

MR. STEWART:

I have been taking notes throughout this conversation and want to reassure the Committee that the Guinn Center is taking in all of this information. Part of the goal is to do landscape analysis that Ms. Levine was discussing. The ultimate goal is to give these evidence-based, actionable policy considerations to the Legislature. The Guinn Center wants the Committee to know it is committed to that as well as providing deep-dive, evidence-based recommendations that can be used during the 83<sup>rd</sup> (2025) Legislative Session. The Guinn Center is pleased with these conversations and the partnerships the Guinn Center hopes to forge going through the process.

SENATOR NEAL:

Sean McCoy from UNLV has been tracking corporate investors to see who is buying properties. I worked with him for almost a year on a bill that was vetoed, and he was extremely helpful.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I know the Guinn Center does great work. The Committee is focusing on items that would be meaningful during the 83<sup>rd</sup> (2025) Legislative Session. I want to recommend speaking with former Senator Julia Ratti, who probably knows more about constructing affordable housing than anyone I have ever met in the state.

During the 82<sup>nd</sup> (2023) Legislative Session, Assemblywoman Jauregui sponsored A.B. 298, which did three basic things that addressed the question of how to keep people in housing and ensure that housing remains affordable. First, the bill prevented landlords from collecting multiple application fees when they were not doing any work for that fee, because individuals said they had to apply to 30 to 40 places at a time and none of those application fees were returned. Second, it made sure that fees being charged were specified and detailed, and that landlords could not charge fees that were not listed in the rental documents. Finally, it created a 10% cap on rent increases for seniors, defined as people over 62 years of age, and people who are more vulnerable or disabled. The idea was that these are people who are generally on fixed incomes and if rent increases more than 10% a year, they will not be able to afford the increase and will likely be evicted. This bill would have provided relief to the people it was targeting. The bill passed out of the Legislature; however, it was vetoed by the Governor. Will part of the stakeholder discussion involve talking to people who would have benefitted from that bill? That is important to know—the practicality of what something like that bill

would have done for people. I know \$150,000 is not a lot of money and the Guinn Center will not have a lot of time, but I think it would be valuable to hear from people and try to quantify how many could have remained in what is now affordable housing, but may no longer be affordable due to fees and rent increases.

MS. LEVINE:

I welcome this conversation. It is important, when doing robust rigorous work, that the right questions be asked, and that is a good use of fiscal dollars. My full title is Director of Economic and Fiscal Policy, so that topic matters to me.

You are right, the Guinn Center is under a time constraint, and I do not want to overpromise and underdeliver and tell you the Guinn Center is going to be able to quantify that information; however, the lived experience of people in the community experiencing challenges around housing could not be more salient. To the extent the Guinn Center can have those conversations and hear about what that looks like for people, that is important to this report because those are the barriers that also need to be reidentified and solidified to make for a strong report.

CHAIR MONROE-MORENO:

Although this request is for a small dollar amount compared to other items heard today, it is a very important issue for the Legislature as displayed in several pieces of legislation during the 82<sup>nd</sup> (2023) Legislative Session.

There have been many comments today that are not included in the backup documentation of what the study will include. I am aware the Guinn Center needs to begin this study, and the approval of these funds will allow that study to be completed promptly so the Legislature will have it available for the 83<sup>rd</sup> (2025) Legislative Session. However, because of the discussion and many other things that were not included as well as the lack of the exact stakeholders, I would request that the Guinn Center provide an informational item at the April 11, 2024, IFC meeting containing a list of stakeholders, so the Committee knows with whom the Guinn Center is communicating. The informational item should also include everything the Committee heard today that was not included in the backup documentation but will be included in the study.

MS. LEVINE:

I am happy to return to the next IFC meeting and provide that information to the Committee.



ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM D.23 AND REQUIRE THE KENNY C. GUINN CENTER FOR POLICY PRIORITIES TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE STATEWIDE STUDY ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT THE APRIL 11, 2024, MEETING OF THE INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THE MEMBERS PRESENT.

**24. Office of the Governor - COVID-19 Relief Programs - FY 2024**

Transfer of \$2,603,241 from the Loss Revenue Reserve category to the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Projects category to support an allocation to the Nevada System of Higher Education to fund supplemental contract security staffing. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount transferred to the ARPA Project category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.25. Work Program #24FR132718. RECEIVED 2-29-24.**

Agenda Items D.24 and D.25 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.25.

**25. Nevada System of Higher Education - System Administration - FY 2024**

Addition of \$2,603,241 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account for supplemental contract security staffing. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount added to the Contract Security Staffing category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.24. Work Program #24FR298601. RECEIVED 2-29-24.**

Agenda Items D.24 and D.25 were discussed jointly.

PATRICIA CHARLTON (Interim Chancellor, NSHE):

I want to first recognize the December 6, 2023, events that occurred at UNLV; the campus had a situation where the most unfortunate event that can happen on a college campus or in any public space, was realized: an active shooter and the loss of three faculty members and a significant injury to a fourth faculty member. NSHE also wants to recognize the amazing response received from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, first responders and police departments throughout the municipalities in Southern Nevada, the fire departments, and hospitals. I would be remiss if I did not also recognize the UNLV Police Department and Chief Garcia and his team who were able to address the situation promptly; it could have been far worse.

Following the events of December 6, 2023, I established an ad hoc committee on public safety that brought together institutions throughout Nevada's higher education system; stakeholders, including Doug Unger with the Nevada Faculty Alliance,

faculty, students, classified staff, every NSHE stakeholder group, and emergency management personnel throughout Nevada to support efforts that will ensure a safe and secure environment within Nevada's higher education system for faculty, staff, students, and the community that engages on NSHE's open campuses.

The request for \$2.6 million is specific to Southern Nevada. These funds and expenditures will occur through UNLV's system office to support and augment staffing needs. This is not the last time I will be coming before the Committee because NSHE has additional needs. However, the highest priority need is to put individuals in front of NSHE campuses, specifically UNLV, as that is the environment in which the incident occurred. NSHE has leveraged the insurance processes, so this funding will pick up from where the insurance processes have occurred, until the end of the calendar year.

Chief Garcia has been actively engaged in recruiting. It has been challenging to recruit and retain police professionals and public safety personnel, but NSHE is hopeful that it will have its currently funded line items secured by the end of the calendar year and be able to support this moving forward. NSHE will also be leveraging its ask, but not limited to personnel costs, it will also leverage resources across its federal delegation and other grant opportunities. NSHE recognizes that resources are limited but also realizes that it needs to work collectively with its institutions to identify other resources.

NSHE will also be making requests through the legislative process and is trying to do this collectively by prioritizing needs through the ad hoc committee. In addition to being the UNLV Police Chief and Vice President of Public Safety, Mr. Garcia is also the Chair of the Committee of Public Safety for the Chancellor's Office. NSHE is prioritizing its request with the institutions.

CHAIR MONROE-MORENO:

Thank you to you and your staff for your efforts to keep students and staff as safe as possible on December 6, 2023. It was a heartbreaking situation, but NSHE staff stepped up and were heroes that day.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MOSCA:

The Legislature is working on the NSHE funding formula. Please explain how these funds might be integrated with the work happening there in the future.

CHRIS VITON (Vice Chancellor of Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer, NSHE):

NSHE is here today specifically to look at this contract through the end of the fiscal year. There will be additional items as NSHE works through the budget requests from the campuses. NSHE anticipates bringing some of those requests forward in the 83<sup>rd</sup> (2025) Legislative Session, whether through the funding formula or otherwise as enhancements.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MOSCA:

It is important to consider how this will be supported in the long term for both students and faculty.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BROWN-MAY:

I want to reiterate previous comments. December 6, 2023, was a day we should have been celebrating birthdays, but instead, were concerned about the whereabouts of students and colleagues. It was a traumatic day for many in the Las Vegas Valley. I can only offer my congratulations for your quick response.

My questions relate to the contract security services and how this contract will address the safety and security needs at UNLV and throughout all NSHE institutions. How will the contracted positions be utilized given the fact there are vacancies? It states in the work program that NSHE anticipates being able to fill vacancies going forward, and this request is only until the end of the year. Please provide further explanation.

Also, funding this through NSHE provides the authority to utilize these contracted security positions anywhere, but it appears the intention is to only use these positions at UNLV. Could those positions be moved to any other high-risk NSHE institution in Southern Nevada?

ADAM GARCIA (Vice President of Public Safety Services/Director of University Police Services Southern Command):

This contract reaches across all higher education institutions in Southern Nevada, including UNLV, Desert Research Institute (DRI), Nevada State University, College of Southern Nevada (CSN), and the NSHE facilities in the south.

Currently, the contract calls for eight officers to be assigned to the UNLV main campus and the DRI, and seven officers to be assigned to the CSN and Nevada State University.

I went before the Board of Regents in December 2022 and requested a critical hire designation, meaning NSHE could hire individuals who are Public Employees' Retirement System retirees. I made a similar request earlier this month, so with that and the support of the Legislature during the 82<sup>nd</sup> (2023) Legislative Session, during which my employees received a considerable raise, NSHE is looking to fill most, if not all, of the vacant positions. There are currently 28 vacancies in the south that NSHE is on track to fill by the end of this calendar year. That will allow NSHE to provide the visibility required for the Southern Nevada campuses and will no longer need the visibility of the contractor group.

MS. CHARLTON:

I wanted to clarify that the expenditures will occur through UNLV. There is a Consolidated Police Force and University Police Command in the south, for which Chief Garcia is the facilitator. UNLV serves as the host institution for all the coordination of public safety. Chief Garcia manages all the Southern Nevada command and Chief Eric James manages the Northern Nevada command. The requested funds are specific to Southern Nevada and under the auspices of Chief Garcia.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BROWN-MAY:

For clarification, the proposal is to hire contracted security as opposed to filling vacant positions with NSHE. I am curious to learn about the training or qualifications of the entities bidding to fill these contracts. There are certain expectations for employees and staff; are those expectations comparable for the organizations that are bidding on these contracts?

MR. GARCIA:

Yes. The criteria established for this security company is much higher than what would typically be seen with a security company. Many of the guards are either prior military or prior law enforcement and undergo a rigorous background check as well as training protocols established within the department, giving a higher level of comfort in using these individuals.

The guards have been in place for just over two months, and one of the officers has already saved the life of a student who likely would have passed away from a separate event, not related to the discussion today. The guards are highly trained and have prior experience; they all have the necessary skills to be employed by NSHE.

There will be a request for proposal (RFP) process and all those requirements will be included in the RFP. The security positions are not being filled in lieu of police officer positions; the police officer positions are being filled as quickly as possible. The security guard contract will be used to support and augment those efforts and provide visibility that is important on the campuses.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

I would also like to thank Chief Garcia, Interim Chancellor Charlton, and everyone on the campus that day who kept the safety of the students in mind while dealing with that unfortunate incident.

I would like confirmation that every student will be safe, but also to ensure there is some focus on where this incident took place at UNLV, so that it is fresh in the minds of students when they are on campus.

In addition, how quickly will the hiring occur, and will personnel be hired in batches or all at once? Please provide a general timeline and clarification on the hiring process.

MR. GARCIA:

NSHE has invited the current security contractor to bid on the new RFP. Given that, the security contractor is aware of the expectations relating to the number of personnel needed. Currently, this group is working at UNLV specifically. The contract will continue if the RFP and funding is approved, at which point they will expand to other campuses. The timeline is to continue at UNLV with the existing contract and then expand to the other campuses within 30 days after the RFP is awarded.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KASAMA:

Thank you for all your work and service during this difficult time. I fully support this request. It is critically important to protect everyone on the NSHE campuses. It is good that this request proposes to bring back retired police officers, which is important because they are already trained, and it will not risk their retirement benefits.

SENATOR NEAL:

Of the \$2.6 million, will any money be used for an environmental design change? I am specifically interested in lighting on and within a mile of campus, including sidewalks. Significant risks occur on sidewalks and lighting reduces crime.

MS. CHARLTON:

NSHE has established the Chancellor's Committee on Public Safety, which is a very broad-based committee looking comprehensively at all public safety elements: lighting, door locking systems, video surveillance, emergency notifications, and training for faculty, staff, students, and those visiting the campuses.

Today's request is only to augment the personnel for the Southern Nevada command. NSHE will be returning to the IFC to prioritize the needs of the entire higher education system. NSHE recognizes this is not unique to higher education; it transcends into the state and state agencies as well. NSHE has open campuses and open landscapes. NSHE welcomes over 100,000 students, 15,000 employees, and countless community members who interact with the campuses. NSHE wants every person who comes in contact with higher education to feel safe, of which lighting is a vital component. NSHE will be prioritizing those needs and coming forward with subsequent IFC requests as well as through the budgetary process; however, NSHE is also leveraging that with either public or private grant opportunities through the federal delegation. NSHE recognizes the state's resources are limited but also recognizes that everyone needs to step up and ensure people feel safe.

MR. GARCIA:

Two committees have been formed. The first is UNLV-centric, formed by President Keith Whitfield, which will look at processes, protocols, and safety enhancements at UNLV. Interim Chancellor Charlton's ad hoc committee, of which I am the Chair, is going to look at a holistic approach across all of NSHE, both north and south.

I have established several things for the ad hoc committee. First, the committee will not just discuss recommendations, it will take action. Within the first 30 to 60 days, the committee will make recommendations to Interim Chancellor Charlton on potential safety enhancements. Within the first 6 months, the committee will make additional recommendations that can be implemented within a short period of time. Finally, the committee will make recommendations for what can be accomplished beyond 12 months to enhance security.

I have made it clear to the subcommittees of the ad hoc committee to look at this from a holistic approach, and come at it from that perspective, with those milestones in place.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA  
ITEMS D.24 AND D.25.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP SECONDED THE MOTION.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I want to publicly thank Chief Garcia. Nobody knows if they will rise to the occasion when put in that position. All the discussions I had with people who were there when the incident occurred, and also during the after-action review, indicate you and your department's actions were heroic and saved lives that day. On behalf of the Legislature and on behalf of the Committee as a whole, thank you for rising to the occasion and making sure that the incident was limited as much as possible.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THE MEMBERS  
PRESENT.

**26. Office of the Governor - COVID-19 Relief Programs - FY 2024**

Transfer of \$873,360 from the Loss Revenue Reserves category to the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) State Agency Allocations category to support an allocation to the Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services to upgrade the security camera systems at Summit View Youth Center and Northern Nevada Youth Training Center. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount transferred to the ARPA State Agency Allocations category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.27. Work Program #24FR132719. RECEIVED 3-1-24.**

Agenda Items D.26 and D.27 were discussed jointly. Refer to discussion and motion for approval under Agenda Item D.27.

**27. Department of Health and Human Services - Child and Family Services - Juvenile Justice Services - FY 2024**

Addition of \$873,360 in federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account to upgrade the security camera systems at Summit View Youth Center and Northern Nevada Youth Training Center. Requires Interim Finance approval since the amount added to the ARPA Security Camera Project category exceeds \$350,000. **RELATES TO ITEM D.26. Work Program #24FRF13831. RECEIVED 3-1-24.**

Agenda Items D.26 and D.27 were discussed jointly.

MARLA MCDADE WILLIAMS (Division Administrator, DCFS, DHHS):

These items relate to upgrading security cameras at the Northern Nevada Youth Training Center and Summit View Youth Center at a cost of \$873,360. Agenda Item D.26 allocates funding from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account and Agenda Item D.27 allocates funding to the DCFS for the agency to spend.

CHAIR MONROE-MORENO:

Will this put the agency in compliance with Section 889 of the federal National Defense Authorization Act and the Prison Rape Elimination Act?

MS. MCDADE WILLIAMS:

Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEMS D.26 AND D.27.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THE MEMBERS PRESENT.

**E. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION - State Public Works Division - Request to receive and expend \$521,653 in federal American Rescue Plan Act, Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Funds transferred from the COVID-19 Relief Programs account for CIP Project 19-C16, Renovation of Collections Storage Building 19, Stewart Campus, for the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, pursuant to NRS 341.121, and to modify the project scope to address collapsed pipes, failed floors and other hazards identified during the design phase of the project, pursuant to NRS 341.145(1)(f). **RELATES TO AGENDA ITEM D.22.****

Agenda Item D.22 and Agenda Item E were discussed jointly.

WIL LEWIS (Administrator, State Public Works Division [SPWD], Department of Administration):

Agenda Item E is a request to receive and expend an additional \$521,653 of ARPA funds for CIP Project 19-C16, the renovation of the collection storage building at the Stewart Facility in Carson City.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS:

With the anticipated change and the request for \$521,653 in additional funds, does the SPWD anticipate that will be sufficient and no additional funding will be required to complete the project?

MR. LEWIS:

Yes, the SPWD performed a cost estimate and feels the requested funds will more than cover the additional modification of the scope being requested.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS MOVED TO APPROVE AGENDA ITEM D.22 AND AGENDA ITEM E.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THE MEMBERS PRESENT.

**F. DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY - Housing Division - INFORMATIONAL ONLY - Status report on the Home Means Nevada Initiative for affordable housing as requested during the April 7, 2022, meeting of the Interim Finance Committee.**

STEVE AICHROTH (Administrator, Nevada Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry):

This is a quick update to the spreadsheets provided for today's meeting. The division has now expended \$74 million, which is about 15% of the Home Means Nevada award. There is a Friday submission deadline for the Board of Finance items, so the division expects a couple more projects to come through at the April Board of Finance meeting, which will change those agreement statuses that are included on the handout. The division received indications from several projects using U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding that the HUD funding has been approved. As the Committee is aware, there is a layered financing capital stack in all of these projects, so effectively, one of those critical components is HUD funding sources. The division has received indications from some of the outstanding developments that those are moving forward.

The division will provide additional updates, including photographs, at the April 11, 2024, IFC meeting.



**G. PUBLIC COMMENT.**

There was no public comment.

**H. ADJOURNMENT.**

Chair Monroe-Moreno adjourned the meeting at 3:53 p.m.

---

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair  
Interim Finance Committee

---

Brenda Erdoes, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau,  
and Secretary, Interim Finance Committee