

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-Second Session
March 23, 2023**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Selena Torres at 9:04 a.m. on Thursday, March 23, 2023, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair
Assemblywoman Bea Duran, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Max Carter
Assemblyman Rich DeLong
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva
Assemblywoman Cecelia González
Assemblyman Bert Gurr
Assemblyman Gregory Koenig
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson, Assembly District No. 30
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst
Judi Bishop, Committee Manager
Lindsey Howell, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tick Segerblom, Commissioner, Clark County
Ross Kinson, President, Northern Nevada Central Labor Council
Mike Pilcher, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Gary Watson, President, Teamsters Union Local 533
Paul Catha, Political Director, Culinary Workers Union Local 226
Richard P. McCann, Executive Officer Ex Officio, Nevada Association of Public
Safety Officers; and Member, Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition
Troyce Krumme, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Metro Police Managers & Supervisors
Association
Susie Martinez, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Nevada State AFL-CIO
Neal Cegate, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Andrew Reavis, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Rita Weisshaar, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Amanda Nelson, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Tamara Weber, Labor Representative, National Nurses United
Chris Gibson, Private Citizen
Marc Ellis, President, Communication Workers of America Local 9413
Eloy Jara, Business Manager and Secretary Treasurer, Laborers' Union Local 169
Liz Sorenson, President, Nevada State AFL-CIO
Anthony Wirta, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
LaNita Troyano, Labor Representative, National Nurses United
Larry Wilson, Board Member At-Large, United Auto Workers Local 2162
Sue Bird, Private Citizen, North Las Vegas, Nevada
Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Michael Hillerby, representing Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe
County
Bill Thomas, Executive Director, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe
County
Angela Castro, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Regional Transportation
Commission of Southern Nevada
Brooke Page, Director-Southwest, Corporation for Supportive Housing
Christine Hess, Executive Director, Nevada Housing Coalition
Dan Musgrove, representing SafeNest; Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow;
and WestCare Foundation
Amy Shogren, representing the Vegas Chamber

Kennedy McKinney, representing Nevada Women's Lobby; and the Human Services Network

Kelly Crompton, Government Affairs Manager, City of Las Vegas

John Norman, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Ashley Garza Kennedy, Principal Management Analyst, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County

Joelle Gutman Dodson, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County Health District

Eva Black, representing SilverSummit HealthPlan

Elyse Monroy-Marsala, representing National Alliance on Mental Illness-Nevada Chapter

Cadence Matijeich, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County

Nicole Rourke, Director of Government and Public Affairs, City of Henderson

Roxanne DeCarlo, Executive Director, The Empowerment Center, Reno, Nevada

Marlene Lockard, representing Service Employees International Union Local 1107

Lea Case, representing Children's Advocacy Alliance

Arielle Edwards, Director of Government Relations, Nevada HAND, Las Vegas, Nevada

John Sande IV, representing Nevada State Apartment Association

Nick Vander Poel, representing Nevada Rural Housing Authority

Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Keith Lynam, Chairman, Nevada REALTORS Legislative Committee

Mackenzie Warren Kay, representing Southern Nevada Home Builders Association; and Ovation Development Corporation

Jarron Gray, Board Chair, Urban Chamber of Commerce, Las Vegas, Nevada

Emily Paulsen, Board Member, Nevada Housing Coalition

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford, Executive Director, Nevada Homeless Alliance, Las Vegas, Nevada

Chair Torres:

[Roll was taken. Committee protocol was reviewed.] We are going to introduce two different bill draft requests (BDR). We have BDR 28-1031 and BDR 18-849.

BDR 28-1031—Revises provisions governing public works. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 391](#).)

BDR 18-849—Revises provisions governing the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 390](#).)

At this time, I will entertain a motion to introduce the BDRs.

ASSEMBLYMAN NGUYEN MOVED FOR COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST 28-1031 AND
BILL DRAFT REQUEST 18-849.

ASSEMBLYMAN DELONG SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HIBBETTS AND TAYLOR
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Our word of the day is "highlights." I know we are going to have a lot of highlights throughout our morning. We are going to begin with one of them: a bill presentation from Assemblywoman Anderson, who used to sit on this Committee.

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 214.

Assembly Bill 214: Revises provisions governing certain regional transportation commissions. (BDR 22-90)

Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson, Assembly District No. 30:

I am here today to present Assembly Bill 214 with the president of Northern Nevada Central Labor Council (NNCL), Ross Kinson; former president of NNCL, Mike Pilcher; and Gary Watson, the president of Teamsters Union Local 533, which is in Washoe County. Commissioner Tick Segerblom will also be joining us via Zoom.

The proposed language you see before you is based on numerous conversations in an attempt to address the increase in violence against bus drivers in our communities. Our bus drivers are treated incredibly poorly. This is not necessarily the school bus drivers. These are individuals who are providing services to the adults as well as to the children who are attempting to go around our communities. Our transit operators and others who work for regional transportation centers or the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) have seen an increase in violence around our nation, but also in our own community. From documented instances in New Mexico to New Jersey—and other places that do not have "New" in their name—Jeff Rosenberg of the Amalgamated Transit Union stated, "It is very common for our workers to get spit on or slapped around, and a lot of times, agencies would try to sweep it under the rug." That was actually from an article written by Jared Brey for *Governing*, which came out in the first week of March.

However, it is an incident that happened this week in our own state that truly shows how difficult it is to be a bus driver and how solitary some of them are treated. As many of you know, on Monday one of our bus drivers in Clark County was attacked. There was only one passenger on that bus. When the police officers came up with the police dog, they were also

attacked. Many times, our bus drivers are not treated with the dignity and respect they deserve. They are, in fact, essential workers. This was especially true during the pandemic and directly following it. The ideas presented today actually have nothing to do with what happened on Monday, but it highlights that this has been happening for some time.

The language being brought forward from the Northern Nevada Central Labor Council and the Teamsters Union Local 533 has been discussed for some time. We are still attempting to find some common ground with the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County, as well as the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada, which has also been experiencing this. I wanted to give a special shout out to Angela Castro, who is with the RTC of Southern Nevada, for attempting to work with us on this even as late as yesterday.

The language brought forward will be a mash-up of the two amendments that have been sent in [[Exhibit C](#), [Exhibit D](#)]. I wanted to respect the 24-hour time frame and get it in by then, but I also respect the fact that we have deadlines. We need to have this hearing today. The language that is actually being presented is still being discussed. We will continue to have those discussions. I am hoping we will be able to find cleanup language very soon. We will continue to have meetings with everybody involved.

With the Chair's permission, I would like to walk through the mash-up of the two amendments. Then I would like to ask Commissioner Segerblom to talk about his experiences with the Transportation Resources Advisory Committee (TRAC). Then I will ask the individuals with me today.

Section 1 of the bill in front of you deals with things like prevailing wage language, apprenticeship programs, health insurance, and misclassifications.

Chair Torres:

We had a question about whether or not were using one of the amendments. We have two.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

We will be using both amendments.

Chair Torres:

I have one that was introduced on behalf of RTC of Washoe County [[Exhibit C](#)] and one from your office [[Exhibit D](#)]. Both of those?

Assemblywoman Anderson:

That is correct. It is a mash-up of the two. Again, this has to do with language we were discussing as late as yesterday and phone calls that even took place last night. We are still trying to get the right language—or, since we all know sometimes the best laws are those nobody is happy with, the language that everybody can handle.

The first thing that will actually be the bill's initial language has to do with section 1. Again, this discusses prevailing wages, apprenticeship programs, health insurance, misclassifications, and other items. There continues to be a robust discussion around these issues. There is a strong possibility that we will be able to figure out a different way to bring that language forward in different conversations or written agreements between the two parties.

For section 2, I would like you to look at the submission from the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County and the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada. The proposed language under section 2 [page 2, [Exhibit C](#)] is something we mostly agree with. There are still a few tiny problems we are dealing with. We are trying to make sure the language is set. This deals with the length of time for maintaining any record, whether video or otherwise, made from the electronic system. It also deals with other policy language as it relates to assault and how long we are able to request that video information to help our employees feel safe.

For section 3, we will use the RTC's proposed amended language, which creates an advisory committee. We are discussing very specific language everyone can be comfortable with. However, I believe the two sides are close to an agreement. This advisory committee would consist of at least two members recommended by the labor organization that is the exclusive bargaining agent and at least one member from the general public. The specific number of members of the advisory committee continues to be discussed. However, if we are using the Clark County, Nevada model, it is no fewer than 8, nor more than 16. I believe this number is due to the larger population, so at this time, I am not sure if those numbers will be the same.

Section 4 through 7 of the bill went into the discussion around section 1 of the bill. Those discussions of definitions and reporting will be addressed in the upcoming amendment.

I realized it would have been wonderful to have another request to push this back. However, I also realize we have deadlines. The Chair was kind enough to push it back once. I wanted to get this out to you. Chair, may I ask Commissioner Segerblom to speak very quickly about the advisory committee in Clark County?

Chair Torres:

I have to say, I am very excited. This is the first time we have had Commissioner Segerblom in the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs this session.

Tick Segerblom, Commissioner, Clark County:

Looking at the membership of your Committee, it looks like the membership of my district. It is pretty impressive to be able to appear before your Committee to present an item I think is critically important. I also want to say, Assemblywoman Anderson's father taught me everything I know, for better or worse. He was the best mentor anyone could ask for. What a legend. It is an honor to be here assisting Assemblywoman Anderson, her bills, and her future career.

I want to speak briefly about the TRAC, which is part of this bill. I am on the RTC down here in Las Vegas as a member of the County Commission. The Transportation Resource Advisory Committee is very valuable to us, because similar to Washoe County, the RTC of Southern Nevada is multijurisdictional. It is great to have a body inputting public opinion to reflect on how the RTC is doing and what we can do better.

As for the subject of this bill—specifically the drivers, how they are being treated, and how we can assist them—they are really at the front lines. They were abused during COVID-19, and that continues now. I cannot brag enough about how the drivers have stepped up to the plate and how they continue to drive and serve the community through thick and thin. They are critical to this.

Going back to the TRAC itself, it is multijurisdictional. It is composed of members of the community—from labor, the chamber of commerce, and different aspects. It is a great way for the Commission and the bus company itself to get input from the community. In Las Vegas, it worked out fantastic. I would urge at least that portion of the bill be strongly supported.

Chair Torres:

Are there any additional remarks?

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I would ask that Mr. Kinson explain a little bit about why this is or the difficulties happening with very specific incidents in Washoe County, if possible. Then I will ask Mike Pilcher to continue on with that. Then we will be open for questions.

Tick Segerblom:

If I can be excused, I have to run off. I hope to be up there after it warms up.

Chair Torres:

It is definitely a highlight of our morning to have you here with us today. Assemblywoman Anderson, please continue with the presentation. I definitely want to have time for members' questions, so go quickly, please.

Ross Kinson, President, Northern Nevada Central Labor Council:

I am here today to speak on behalf of the transit operators, the coach operators, dispatchers, mechanics—the workers, essentially. I am speaking in support of this bill. We have been working closely with the RTC, both in Washoe County and southern Nevada. We had several meetings to go over this language to make sure we were working together, presenting something that was solutional for both sides—the workers and the RTC—and putting something before you that brought real solutions. The issues we are focusing on, as was spoken to already, are really around safety and collaboration. That comes in the form of a benefit southern Nevada has had for a while, the TRAC. We do not have that up in the north. We would like to have something like that, to be able to put working folks—community members—on a committee to find solutions and help the RTCs out. While it is true we are

still working to hammer down some of the language, we believe we are close. All the affected parties have been working closely together on this. I know time is limited, so I will end it there. If you have any questions, we are here to take them.

Mike Pilcher, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

As of last month, I am the former president of the Northern Nevada Central Labor Council. We started this journey potentially utilizing *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 277A as the vehicle for change. When we decided to do that, I reached out to our national AFL-CIO [American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations] in Washington, D.C., and solicited the advice of the Transportation Trades Department, which looks at multiple states and what is happening. From the start, I asked them to help us with the chapter in what we could do to assist the RTCs and our metropolitan planning organizations, as well as where they thought we could improve the chapter.

Procurement was one thing. We suggest some higher standards for Nevada's limited and fragile tax dollars for public transit. Preserving the video surveillance for a longer period of time was another, so as to have a review to improve the safety of passengers and drivers with respect to engineering controls, environmental controls, or better training. Finally, as my colleagues have said, we suggest bringing a TRAC up to Washoe County, where the population is approaching half a million. It is time. We would like to have some members on that committee who actually do the transportation. From the start, it has been a journey to assist our metropolitan planning organizations.

Finally, in speaking with the executive director of the RTC of Washoe County and the deputy director of the RTC of southern Nevada, I can hear in their voice that they have tremendous concerns about the future of public transit with respect to budgeting. To me, their indications are clear. They can barely expect to keep the system running with their goals, let alone accomplish some of our suggestions to improve the transit system throughout Nevada. I hope this is the proper arena to tell you that.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Please accept my apology for the disjointed language. This is not usually how I like to present information. However, I understand the deadlines we are under as a Legislature. I appreciate this Committee's understanding, and I think we are all ready for questions. I will more than likely be phoning these three friends and others to help us out with them.

Chair Torres:

Thank you for sharing those highlights with us. Members, any questions?

Assemblywoman Thomas:

I understand the deadlines. I am a little confused about your bill, to say the least. I understand your amendment and everything. I guess I have a comment and a question. You come to us for legislation on something that, to me, is a contract negotiation with the employers of the RTC. When your employees are concerned about safety, that is a contract.

I do not see this happening here right now. To me, it is government overreach. You want the government to satisfy a contract negotiation. I think that is wrong. That is my comment.

My second comment is, I had the pleasure of being a rider of the RTC a couple of years ago. I come from an area where the bus service runs every 10 to 15 minutes. Here, I have to wait 55 minutes for a bus that breaks down and wait another 55 minutes for another bus. I did not become angry and hostile, but there were other people who were. I can understand the public's being angry and hostile, because we are not getting the service we should from the RTC. I truly understand we want to protect our employees from the hostility of the public—being spat upon, hit, all of that—but that is a contract negotiation.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

That is one reason why section 1 continues to be discussed and will more than likely be amended out. It is based on those other discussions. The reality, however, is exactly what you brought up in the second portion. Many times, the employees have brought forward this information and have been ignored. At one point, our Northern Nevada Central Labor Council felt this was the only way to be heard. Since this bill has been discussed, there has been a much more open door, from what I hear. I agree with you. It is sad we have to utilize the legislative process in this way. Luckily, there has been change in management.

However, the RTC in the northern Nevada area has undergone three strikes in a matter of a few months based on an inability to have an open door. Those open doors might have been from one side or the other, but for whatever reason, the voices of the people who work for the RTC were either not being listened to or were being ignored. It is sad we had to use this, but that is the reality. At times, there are some people who will not listen unless we do this.

The other issue, the timing of the bus services, is not just about the people who are driving the buses. It is also about the fact that we are unable to keep individuals, as you know. However, what I believe you are talking about occurred two or three years ago. I have also been in a situation where I had to take the bus. I make a plan, and then it is not always the same. Mr. Watson, do you want to add to that, or are you comfortable?

Gary Watson, President, Teamsters Union Local 533:

I want to speak to the turnover rate within this system. Right now, they have roughly 40 percent of the employees for less than one year of service. They have a high turnover rate in this system, and there need to be a lot of fixes to that.

Chair Torres:

Based off some questions from members, could we get clarification on whether or not this is specifically looking at local and city buses? Does this apply to school buses?

Assemblywoman Anderson:

That is correct. It is only for the RTC buses. That is exactly why we are trying to bring forward language to have TRAC or a committee to look at those issues as well. This does not deal with the Washoe County School District or any school district buses.

Chair Torres:

I think for many Committee members, when we hear "buses," we immediately think of yellow buses with kids. I appreciate the clarification.

Assemblywoman González:

I have definitely heard similar concerns from workers in my district. I know you are working on an amendment, but what is the current process of surveillance? What does that time frame look like? Why are we asking for changes in that area?

Ross Kinson:

The current process is, there are cameras on the buses and cameras at the facilities. For the cameras on the bus, my understanding is that the information, the recording, is held for about three days. Say something happens, and it is not immediately noted. One of our drivers is attacked by a passenger, does not understand the process—most of our drivers are new at this point—and does not understand they have the right to advocate for or defend themselves. That information could be lost. That is why we are looking for an extension to hold those records. I hope that answers the question. If you need further clarification, please let me know.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

Thank you for bringing up a very important issue. My dad was an RTC bus driver. Back then, it was a CAT [Citizens Area Transit] bus. He told me stories about some of the experiences he had being a bus driver on the Carey route, the Lake Mead Boulevard route, and the Las Vegas Boulevard route. Then there was the paratransit. My question is this: What is the current starting wage for RTC bus drivers in Clark County, as well as here in Washoe County?

Gary Watson:

I cannot speak to Clark County's starting wage, but I can speak to Washoe County's starting wage. It is a little over \$20 an hour.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I can get you the Clark County wage. I will text somebody and ask for that.

Assemblywoman Duran:

Is it a policy, or are you going to try to include this to negotiate that time change? I think sometimes you can work that out with the company. Is the problem that they are not willing to cooperate with you on those things? I know it is important to save evidence, just as a policy, because there are issues where people get hurt, and they do not request that information.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I believe at this time, it is something both negotiated and discussed. You will notice, under section 3 of the language we presented, it basically says the TRAC could be asked to discuss anything as assigned by RTC. That is one area. It would make sense for the idea of the

policy to come from that organization. The other thing is, the contract is only really for the bus drivers. I am not sure exactly what the process would be, so I am going to phone a friend.

Mike Pilcher:

We are in collaboration talks with the RTC of southern Nevada and the RTC of Washoe. Southern Nevada has a policy that retains it for 7 days. We are asking for a little longer. Washoe County has the ability to hold it for 14 days. We have discussed a letter of commitment to that effect, to make a policy change and remove it from chapter.

Assemblyman Carter:

I wanted to comment on, but also ask about, section 1 of the bill. I see in there a long-overdue attempt to require the prevailing wage funds to go where they are supposed to: supporting public health and requiring a family-based health plan. It does not address retirement, but it addresses training. Part of the reason our tax dollars pay those prevailing wage portions is so we do not have people—construction workers, primarily—choosing to put it all on the check. The next thing we know, there is indigent care. Everybody knows Amazon is our biggest Medicaid recipient. Are we still trying to maintain that somewhere, trying to push the effort forward to get those training and health care dollars spent where they are supposed to?

Mike Pilcher:

That is a baseline threshold we looked at putting into chapter to help our RTCs. We can always negotiate those issues, and we do so. We thought, in the best interest of the RTCs of the metropolitan planning organizations, it is a heads-up for the international corporations that want to bid for our Nevada dollars: Look, there are some baselines. The baseline expectation is, you will provide health care, industrial insurance, and the basic prevailing wages that allow workers to be self-sufficient. There is some mention in there because the internationals are not quite sure. It is not a regular project like the full-time transit system is, but we do occasionally build new bus stops. We do build a bus terminal; there is one scheduled for up north. We would like to see those public dollars generate NRS Chapter 338 and prevailing wage, so our people can be self-sufficient and afford to live in the community where they work. I hope that answers your question.

Chair Torres:

Any additional questions? Seeing none, we will invite anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 214.

Paul Catha, Political Director, Culinary Workers Union Local 226:

We support the bill.

Richard P. McCann, Executive Officer Ex Officio, Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; and Member, Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition:

Safety is everyone's concern. Frankly, it is the only reason I am here, because this is a safety issue. There are a lot of colors on these [[Exhibit C](#), [Exhibit D](#)]
—purple, blue, red, green, and

orange. It is pretty. Get it to one color: black. You do that, and you maintain safety concerns—which are all I am here for—and we are all in favor of this.

Troyce Krumme, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Metro Police Managers & Supervisors Association:

We are also here in support of this bill based on the safety. While I appreciate the sponsor pointing out the incident from Monday night, explaining it as an attack on the bus driver, I am going to provide a bit of extra information. That bus driver was allegedly struck with a large piece of concrete, which kicked that unfortunate series of events off. Three of the officers who responded ended up getting into a struggle with the gentleman alleged to have done that and walked away. One got punched in the face, another officer got struck with a large rock, and one of the other officers ended up having part of his ear bitten off. These bus drivers face this thing on a daily basis. I think bodies responsible for serving safety to public servants deserve to have that safety met.

Susie Martinez, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Nevada State AFL-CIO:

When I was working at my job, I also had to advocate for us to get safety buttons, because the customers were getting very aggressive. The struggle is real. At the end of the day, we want ourselves, our families, and the people who are riding the bus to get home safely from work. We are in support of Assembly Bill 214.

Neal Cegate, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am with the Labor Union Local 169. We are in support of the bill.

Andrew Reavis, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am in full support of A.B. 214. I believe the Committee should be as well. When companies do not take a worker's safety seriously, it is a very big issue. If the company is not going to take responsibility, it is something that needs to be legislated. At that point, bus drivers being attacked is not a contractual issue. This is not between a union and an employer. This is a public safety issue, period. If the State Legislature needs to step in, then the State Legislature needs to step in. If the Legislature will not step in, then we need a new state Legislature.

Rita Weisshaar, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am in full support of Assembly Bill 214, and I urge the Committee to support it as well.

Amanda Nelson, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am here in full support of Assembly Bill 214, and I urge the Committee to support it as well. I am a bus driver for Keolis. In my years of service, my friends have been assaulted, punched in the face, and sexually assaulted. We need to hold our public transportation systems accountable. We need to ensure workers have a voice in their day-to-day job and that we get some more protections.

Tamara Weber, Labor Representative, National Nurses United:

I am here in full support of Assembly Bill 214, and we urge the Committee to support this as well.

Chris Gibson, Private Citizen:

I am with National Nurses United. I am here in full support of Assembly Bill 214, and I urge the Committee to support it as well.

Marc Ellis, President, Communication Workers of America Local 9413:

On behalf of everybody else, I would like to say ditto.

Eloy Jara, Business Manager and Secretary Treasurer, Laborers' Union Local 169:

We are in full support.

Liz Sorenson, President, Nevada State AFL-CIO:

I am here in full support of Assembly Bill 214 this morning, and I urge the Committee to support the bill as well.

Anthony Wirta, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am here to support Assembly Bill 214, and I urge the Committee to support it as well.

LaNita Troyano, Labor Representative, National Nurses United:

I am here in full support of Assembly Bill 214, and we urge the Committee to support it as well.

Larry Wilson, Board Member At-Large, United Auto Workers Local 2162:

I am in full support of A.B. 214.

Sue Bird, Private Citizen, North Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am in full support of Assembly Bill 214, and I urge the Committee to support it as well. Having been injured before, I know sometimes you do not know for quite some time whether you have been hurt or not. A quick Google search says you have one to three years to file an assault, so I should have that film available. It is everyone's responsibility to have a safe workplace. Please support the bill.

[A letter in support of A.B. 214 was submitted by Olivia Tanager, Program Manager-Environmental Justice, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, [Exhibit E](#).]

Chair Torres:

Does anyone else wish to testify in support of A.B. 214? [There was no one.] At this time, I will invite anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 214.

Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

I would like to thank the bill sponsor for speaking with the Vegas Chamber about the bill. The Chamber's concern on A.B. 214 is not the intent, public safety, or the safety of its

workers or employees. It is regarding the board composition, the advisory council in section 3. As you know, the RTC of Southern Nevada has had a very effective and successful TRAC, which the Chamber is a member of. As you heard earlier, it has been a cross section of labor, business, community members, industry holders, and public citizens. We want to ensure there are no unintended consequences that would change the dynamic and effectiveness of that board. That is where our concerns stem. We look forward to seeing the final amendment coming forward.

Michael Hillerby, representing Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County:

First, we would like to thank the sponsor and the proponents for the productive conversations we have had of late. We do think there is progress being made and are confident we can come to a solution that is a combination of statutory changes and, as Assemblywoman Thomas pointed out, contractual changes. We think we are making good progress in that. Bill Thomas, our executive director, is here. He will speak in a moment. I want to start by saying, the safety of our riders and our passengers is our number-one priority. It always has been. That is what we are focused on. I know our colleagues in the RTC of Southern Nevada are in the Las Vegas location and will say the same thing.

Based on some of the good questions from the Committee, I want to clarify a couple of things. As Mr. Kinson said, we have different systems in the transit stations versus the mobile systems on the buses. Right now, in the transit system, we save those videos for 30 days. On the mobile equipment, the buses, that is saved for 7 days. Again, we are pretty confident we can work on something that addresses the issue of making sure drivers or passengers have time to notify us. Saving video, as you all understand, is expensive. We need to find what the right balance of that is. We think we are pretty close. On a number of the other issues, such as the makeup of an advisory committee, we are happy to have union representation in this process, as you have heard. It is a public body. We welcome that. We will continue to work, and we appreciate the comments you have had.

To Assemblyman Carter's question about contracting, RTC follows all state and federal procurement and purchasing laws. We have a number of additional pieces that are put on by the Federal Transit Administration, because we have federal money. We gladly and rigorously do that. With that, I will let Mr. Thomas speak. We will be happy to answer questions.

Bill Thomas, Executive Director, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County:

We are very pleased Assemblywoman Anderson has opened this bill to give us an opportunity to participate. I wanted to make sure the Committee is aware that from our perspective, we are not talking as an agency. We are talking as a public entity that was created to provide a critical service. We do about 4.3 million rides a year, much fewer than southern Nevada, but 60 percent of the people we serve do not have cars and 77 percent are low income. When you look at the demographic of whom we serve with our buses, it is disproportionately the elderly, the disabled, and people of color. That is who uses the bus.

When we approach this, we do not necessarily see it as a labor/management issue. We see it as a societal issue. We have to have bus drivers. We cannot run our buses without them. Then, as Assemblywoman Thomas said, people wisely get frustrated when their bus does not show up on time or when it is supposed to. We should all be focusing on that.

We are very concerned about the fiscal consequences of the bill as written. That is why we are glad Assemblywoman Anderson is letting us participate. At the end of the day, whatever money we spend on this to address where we are going comes directly out of the service we can provide. We are a publicly funded entity. Local sales tax pays for the operations. Local sales taxes are based on a formula. It has nothing to do with demand. It has nothing to do with cost. It is what it is. We are spending any dollar we get wisely, but we do not control how much we get. Whenever things are added in terms of cost to us, know at the end of the day, it ultimately comes to the service and what services we can provide. Thank you to Assemblywoman Anderson for allowing us to participate and hopefully make this bill what it is intended to be, which is addressing a safety issue for our bus drivers. We care very much about them. I said it once, and I will say it again: We need them.

Chair Torres:

Members, any questions? We do not see any. Is there anyone else wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 214? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 214?

Angela Castro, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada:

We are testifying in neutral today. We remain committed to the safety of our operators, our riders, and our community. We agree that our operators are essential workers, and our transit system is part of our economic ecosystem. We remain committed to working with the bill sponsor and the union. As discussed earlier, we are still working on some language, and we are hopeful in finding a resolution we can all agree to and bring forth to the Committee. To Assemblyman D'Silva: Thank you to your dad for his service. To answer your questions, our operators make \$18.50. As of July, they will make \$21.

Chair Torres:

Thank you for that information, Ms. Castro. Is there anyone else wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 214? [There was no one.] I will invite the bill sponsor up for any highlights—quick, brief remarks.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I will make some very brief remarks. No highlights from me. Thank you very much for the questions. They allowed for some clarification. I am looking forward to bringing an amendment forward that allows everybody's voice to be heard.

Chair Torres:

I will close the hearing the hearing on A.B. 214. I will open the hearing on A.B. 310.

Assembly Bill 310: Revises provisions governing affordable housing. (BDR 25-1032)

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1:

I lovingly say my district is the best in the entire state. That is why it is number-one. Joining me here at the table, I have technical assistance. I have Ms. Brooke Page, who is the director of the Southwest Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH), and Ms. Christine Hess, who is the executive director of the Nevada Housing Coalition.

To give you a little background about why we are here for A.B. 310, in 2013, former Governor Brian Sandoval issued Executive Order 2013-20, establishing the Nevada Interagency Council on Homelessness to coordinate and focus the state's efforts to effectively address the challenges of homelessness in our state. The Council provided the opportunity for Nevada to engage in an integrated approach regarding homelessness and promote interagency cooperation.

Jump forward a few years. Many of you on this Committee did not have the privilege of serving alongside my friend, Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson. He passed away unexpectedly during our 2019 legislative session. One of the issues he was most passionate about was homelessness. Assembly Bill 174 of the 80th Session was one of the bills he carried. We are able to codify that shortly after his passing. The Nevada Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing was created by that. I would like to thank Assemblywoman Duran for serving on the Council for the past two interim sessions.

Assembly Bill 310 builds on the work of many individuals who have come before me and you. It provides much-needed funding for the interaction issues of homelessness. With that, I will briefly summarize the bill and discuss a proposed amendment [[Exhibit F](#)]. We got the bill and felt there were some language changes needed to clarify it. The amendment should be up on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), if you do not have it in front of you.

The bill summary:

Section 2 of this bill requires the Division to, subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes, develop and implement a supportive housing grant program. The program must include a process for applying for a grant to (1) procure and develop supportive housing; and (2) fund the operation of a supportive housing partnership. Section 2 also requires the Division to: (1) consult with the Nevada Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing before approving any application for a grant to procure and develop supportive housing; (2) adopt regulations to carry out the grant program which must include the criteria for eligibility to receive money and procedures for the submission and review of applications; and (3) submit an annual report containing certain information about the grant program to the Governor and the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

The bill creates the Nevada Supportive Housing Development Fund in the State Treasury to be used to carry out the grant program and makes an appropriation to the State General Fund in the amount of \$32.2 million.

The proposed amendment before you made some needed changes to the language. Section 2, subsection 1, paragraphs (a) and (c) of the amendment expand the allowable use of the grant to include training and building the capacity of supportive housing partnerships and assessing the progress of supportive housing in Nevada [pages 2-3, [Exhibit F](#)]. Section 2, subsection 4 of the amendment adds the Chair of the Nevada Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing as a recipient of the annual report required [page 2]. In section 2, subsection 6 [pages 4-5], the definition of "supportive housing" is revised to mean this:

[S]ubsidized housing that prioritizes people who can benefit from comprehensive support services to retain tenancy and utilizes admission practices designed to lower barriers to entry than would be typical for other subsidized or unsubsidized rental housing, especially related to rental history, criminal history, and source of income. Supportive housing is paired with on-site or off-site voluntary and tenant-centered tenancy support services designed to

- a) support a person living with a disabling behavioral and physical health condition(s), who experienced homelessness or unnecessary institutionalization, or was at imminent risk of homelessness prior to moving into housing to retain their housing, and
- b) provides tenancy supports to assist with achieving successful tenancy, improving health status, and connects tenants with community-based services, health care, treatment, and/or employment services.

"Supportive housing is subject to all of the rights and responsibilities defined in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 118A" [page 5, [Exhibit F](#)], which is a chapter of NRS related to landlord and tenant dwellings.

With your permission, Madam Chair, I will now turn the presentation over to my copresenters.

Brooke Page, Director-Southwest, Corporation for Supportive Housing:

It is a privilege for us to be here. As Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno mentioned, I sit on the backs of giants and the folks who have paved the way to have these conversations. We want to thank the Nevada Housing Coalition. I am going to turn it over to my dear friend and colleague, Christine Hess, to start our presentation today.

Christine Hess, Executive Director, Nevada Housing Coalition:

This is truly an exciting day. When I woke up this morning, I was like, Wow, this is awesome. If you are not familiar with the Nevada Housing Coalition, we are a statewide nonprofit working to promote affordable housing for all Nevadans [page 2, [Exhibit G](#)]. We

advance our work through education, advocacy, and collaboration. Assembly Bill 310 is an example of the culmination of all three of our priorities.

The slide I have here on the screen [page 3, [Exhibit G](#)] depicts the various types of housing that make up the housing spectrum. We have a severe shortage of affordable housing across our state, but today's focus is on supportive housing. Affordable housing is defined as housing in which the occupants pay no more than 30 percent of their income on their housing. Supportive housing is purpose-built, affordable rental housing that is not only the roof over someone's head, but also provides the wraparound services to keep that person or family stably housed. In Nevada, we have very little supportive housing, and we do not have the infrastructure in place to expand this housing and effectively capture the federal funds we are leaving on the table. For example, in Reno, where are individuals going after the Nevada Cares Campus or Our Place? In Las Vegas, where do you go after The Courtyard Homeless Resource Center or from shelters?

Yesterday at the Nevada Housing Coalition's Lunch & Learn event, this information was presented by RCG Economics to understand the housing landscape across our state [page 4]. You can see current average rents for our state and our two large metro areas in the second column. The third column shows the household income necessary to afford these rents. In the fourth column, you will see the actual median renter household income. In our state, the average rent is \$1,458 per month. In order to afford this, a household must earn \$62,500 per year, but the median renter household income in Nevada is just \$49,200.

This validates what you all are hearing in your communities from many renters: Nevada's housing is unaffordable. It also helps explain why we are seeing our homelessness rates increase. A study by Zillow showed communities in which households pay more than 32 percent of their income on rent have higher rates of homelessness. Affordable or subsidized housing is one solution to help solve for this housing instability. For Nevadans at high risk of homelessness or who are experiencing homelessness, supportive housing can stop their cycling through crisis response services.

Supportive housing is not exclusively for Nevadans with incomes below 30 percent of the area median income, but they are typically deeply subsidized [page 5]. This chart reflects our current subsidized inventory—I did not have time to update it for 2023. We are at 37,000 units now, but we are pretty darn close here, so for today's conversation, I think this will make the point. These are our affordable properties with income restrictions and rents below market.

For today, I would like you to see what we are building. Nearly half of our subsidized inventory is serving households at 60 percent of area median income or higher. Only 3 percent of our current inventory serves our most vulnerable populations making less than 30 percent of area median income. The housing that serves our extremely low-income Nevadans is—not exclusively, but typically—where you will find our supportive housing supply.

Why is this housing not getting built? We have amazing for-profit and nonprofit affordable housing developers who want to build this housing, but for funding the services. The Housing Division manages the funds and financial tools to support the bricks and sticks, but in order to be financially feasible, supportive housing also requires funds for services. A supportive housing development fund will allow the Division to be the one-stop shop for our existing developers who are already doing this good work.

While we automatically think of our metro areas, this slide [page 6, [Exhibit G](#)] shows our challenges are statewide. I want to point to the rural communities. In our rural communities, 7 out of 10 extremely low-income households are paying more than 30 percent of their income on their housing. It is unaffordable.

Before we move on to discuss supportive housing in detail, I want to share this information [page 7]. Although yes, we know we need more housing supply overall, and yes, Nevadans across income levels and across our state are feeling the pinch of the high cost, the greatest burden is on our extremely low-income Nevadans.

On the far right on this slide [page 7], you will see 86 percent of Nevadans who make less than about \$25,000 per year—about \$20,00 to \$25,000—are paying more than half of their income on rent. In the middle, you will see that if they are out looking for a place to live, there are only 17 affordable homes for every 100 families looking. By the way, this is once again the worst in the country, by quite a margin this year.

Who is suffering from the severe shortage? That is the pie chart on the left [page 7]. Sometimes there are some misperceptions about who represents our extremely low-income households. It is seniors. It is veterans. It is those with disabling conditions, caregivers, and yes, the workers in our communities working and helping sustain our economies. If you remember from our subsidized housing inventory, this is the least bill-affordable housing in our state. This is the category in which supportive housing falls. There are many Nevadans who supportive housing could serve. I am going to turn it over to Brooke Page.

Brooke Page:

Thank you so much for paving that data. It is important for us to understand the context and why we are advocating for supportive housing. A lot of this work has been done in the Interagency Council on Homelessness to Housing Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno referenced. A definition has already been adopted; it is now part of the amendment [[Exhibit F](#)]. Why supportive housing [page 8, [Exhibit G](#)]? Because it is cost-effective. We know when we provide a person with a home, it provides them with stability that helps them not cycle in our crisis response system.

Here is some data we have been tracking and modeling: We know nine days in an emergency room (ER) equals three months in a jail cell equals the same amount as one year in supportive housing. The cost of doing nothing and not creating the housing stock we need is costing us more. Having that effective housing strategy is really important.

The benefits of supportive housing are endless in terms of the person who has a home and the keys to live and provide for their families [page 9, [Exhibit G](#)]. Some components we want to make sure you are aware of are the importance of supportive housing and the fact that we are talking about folks who need this level of intervention. They probably have not been able to get access to a home, possibly because of challenges or barriers in their life. This is an opportunity to be all-inclusive for our veterans who need access to housing, our seniors who might be cost-burdened because of limited or fixed incomes, or our young people who are transitioning into adulthood. There are multiple populations that can benefit from this housing intervention.

There are 30 years of research and a lot of communities that have been implementing supportive housing. We want to be able to create that framework and infrastructure in Nevada. We want to be able to provide a home for folks who can afford it. We know there are people working and making 30 percent of our area median income. They need a place to live, an affordable home. They need a lease that protects tenants—that way, they can navigate landlord-tenant law to ensure they have those protections. We want to ensure we have the services.

We are going to spend some time on that today, because we want to recognize the importance of this. We do not have this service structure in place, financially. That is the gap. I sit on a lot of advisory committees. When I ask developers why we are not building supportive housing, a lot of them say, Because it does not pencil, and we do not have the services to do this work. This is an opportunity for us to invest resources into the services that are needed.

There is a differentiation that it is important for us to distinguish, because we have great work—a lot of important affordable housing stock in our communities [page 10]. Right now, there is a whole field of folks providing residents services, which is really important—shout-out to those service workers who are doing important work. We like to differentiate between resident services and supportive housing. When we expect a person to manage a building that might have 200 people in it, there is not going to be a lot of individualized support in that type of setting, but folks are doing it. They are providing information and referrals. They are brokering relationships in the community. We want to recognize that. Supportive housing provides us with the opportunity to provide more targeted support to our tenants—low caseload sizes of maybe 1 to 15, or 20 at the max. These folks need that level of intensity. This provides us with that support.

On the next slide [page 11], we show the impacts and the benefits of this model. This is mixed staffing with supportive housing. We have tenant supports—a case manager who is helping somebody get out of a shelter setting or the Courtyard and transition into a permanent place to stay. It is part of the staffing pattern. We need those pre-tenancy supports and low caseload sizes. We need diverse people. We need people with culturally responsive connections who can meet people where they are, build that rapport, and build that relationship. Having a diverse workforce to do this is important.

In our system, right now we use a model called scattered-site housing a lot, where folks may have tenancy support services or a housing voucher [page 11, [Exhibit G](#)]. We rely on our private market landlords, who are carrying this work and helping us so much with our inventory, to house people. A model we do not do a lot of—but is effective across the country—is single-site supportive housing. Much of that strategy requires on-site case management. Right now, we are brokering those relationships with other case managers and hoping people show up. Having dedicated case managers will make sure our property managers are supported and our tenants are supported in housing.

This is an example [page 13]. I will not go into all the details, but this is a pathway for how somebody can navigate into supportive housing. I know there are questions around this: How do people access this, and how do we ensure the people who need this level of support are actually getting access to housing? This provides an opportunity to see pre-tenancy, where somebody might be coming from a shelter setting or the streets. Maybe they are inappropriately coming from, or being discharged from, an institutional setting. This is an opportunity for us to meet them where they are and help them navigate, find a place to stay, and be stabilized in housing with those wraparound supports.

We know this works [14]. This is an evidence-based intervention. These are outcomes we know we can achieve if we provide quality services and an affordable place to live. We know tenants stay housed for the long term. People increase their health—housing is health care. They improve their health and increase their income. They create community, because they are in a place where they can stabilize, address goals, and maybe get a career or do gardening—whatever that looks like. We are providing somebody with stability.

As I wrap up, I want you all to recognize that we are not leveraging our federal resources because we do not have the infrastructure to do this level of work [page 15]. With the infrastructure in place, we could be going after so many different funding sources, which could fund and sustain supportive housing for the long haul. Because we do not have the infrastructure, we are not tracking it, measuring it, prioritizing it, or building it. We cannot leverage funding. It is important that we create this infrastructure. That way, we can make sure we are doing this and tracking it.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno already went over the bill [page 16]. I am not going to necessarily go into the details of this, but we will open it up and entertain any questions [page 17].

Chair Torres:

Ms. Page, Ms. Hess, thank you for meeting with me ahead of time. I understand, and I want Committee members to understand, the quick nature of this process. This bill was actually introduced last week, so they might not have had the opportunity to meet with every single one of us. They are definitely open to continuing those conversations.

I want to start by asking a couple of questions to help clarify the presentation, because we met for quite a while yesterday. You never know. Even though it is a two-page bill, it still

took me a while to wrap my head around what the goal of this bill is. I want to make sure we have a good understanding of supportive housing. From our conversation yesterday, my understanding is, there are different types of affordable housing available. There are obviously federal programs available. Committee members are probably familiar with something like Section 8. There are projects available in our communities. You have these neighborhood residential areas. For something like Section 8, where you have funds and you can go out, your rent would be paid for by federal government. You are getting a check from HUD [U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development], and that is used to pay for those services, but you are not receiving any other services. You are not receiving access to health care. You are not paired with a caseworker who is connecting you to these other services.

This would be similar in where it is housed. You can go to Nevada Partners in southern Nevada right now. They will help you complete the application for Section 8. My understanding is, this is kind of similar. You can go to an organization like Nevada Partners, but they are going to provide more complete case management. Once you are in one of these programs, you would have access to something similar to a case worker within your residence. I imagine in an apartment complex, instead of me only going to the site manager every time I have to pay the rent, I can also go there when I need help accessing health care services, food, or job reentry. They can connect me to those tools and services. Am I understanding that right, or can you expand on that?

Brooke Page:

You are absolutely right. This is an opportunity for us to provide services on-site, in the home, and to support and meet tenants where they are. Already, our providers who are doing this work do wonderful things in the community, but they are navigating in a scatter-site model where there are so many people all across the community. It is hard to provide those intensive services on a smaller caseload size. For the folks who need it, this provides that service on-site.

Chair Torres:

There was another question about whether or not this is building the houses or allowing for you to procure. The developers would develop the houses. Then this would allow for these funds to be used to procure that housing. That is how I read it in the legislation. Would they be used to help with the building and maintaining of that housing, so those services continue to be available to community members?

Christine Hess:

These funds would fund the services that come alongside the buildings. These would not fund the actual units. However, in order to build the units that serve a population not being served right now, they must have these funds. These funds would attach directly to those units. It can also be developer-driven. Right now, we have developers in the queue who want to do this housing. They have even started down the road of this housing, but they do not have the services, especially for the amount of time we are committing to keep these rents restricted. These are assets for our communities.

Chair Torres:

Thank you for allowing me to dig in. I want to make sure we have it very clear for the record. I also want Committee members to understand what this conversation is about. We might actually want to strengthen the language in section 2 a bit. As it reads right now, on page 2, lines 5 through 6 of the bill, it states the grant program would be used for the purpose of awarding grants for the development of supportive housing. "Development" does almost suggest development building. We might want to look into that and strengthen some of the language in section 2, subsection 1.

Assemblyman DeLong:

What is the size of the population you are expecting supportive housing to serve?

Brooke Page:

We have a national supportive housing needs assessment at the organization I represent, Corporation for Supportive Housing. We estimate there are roughly 7,000 people who need this level of supportive housing in Nevada. Part of what we are asking in the conceptual amendment is that we track and do a needs assessment to understand the magnitude of this need, so we can come back and have a robust report on what the need is, who is getting served, and how this is being made operational.

Assemblyman DeLong:

Of those 7,000, what is the breakdown between the urban centers versus the underserved communities in the rural part of the state?

Brooke Page:

That is exactly what we want to understand. Right now, we do not have a statewide supportive housing needs assessment to speak to those specific rural or urban implications. We know the need is great. Folks right now are stuck in emergency crisis response, because we do not have the housing infrastructure. We want to be able to provide the time to assess what that truly looks like.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

This is one of those "what are we doing about housing" bills. As a state, it is more challenging, because we are so far away. The clarifying questions helped a lot. There is one other area you may have covered, but I may have missed it. I know there is a request going to a different committee for funds on this. From a policy standpoint, do you envision who applies for the grant dollars? Say this passes, the governor signs it, the funds are secured, and so on. Now there is a grant set up. Who applies for those funds? I will have a follow-up question after I get that answer.

Christine Hess:

A lot of that will be developed in rule. However, the applicants are going to be the developers. I will say, in case you did not know from the presentation [[Exhibit G](#)], supportive housing is not my area of expertise—that is why we have Brooke Page here—but I have come so far to understand how important it is in our communities. It is missing.

It would be one applicant. It could also be service providers coming in. There are also capacity-building grants. A lot of why this is not happening is because we need to build capacity. I was in a meeting with our northern Nevada tribal communities yesterday. We were talking about the supportive services work happening there. They are rural as well, so they have ultra-challenges. They could also use some support for capacity. We talked about Assembly Bill 310. It could be developers; it could be service providers—those interested in providing services directly linked to housing. With this fund housed in the Housing Division, that gives me confidence we are funding services attached directly to housing which is going to help someone be stable housed.

Assemblywoman Taylor:

Theoretically, the way this could look is, there is a developer—apparently, there are many who would like to do more of this—but I do not have the funds to provide support. They are going to build a complex, and they would like it to be supportive housing. They would apply for a grant that would give them the money to house someone there. They do not run it, but it is someone who comes from, with all due respect, the housing people. They will get the funds to make that a part of what they build, house someone there, and pay for that person to continue to stay there.

Brooke Page:

Those are really important clarifications. The developer would have a budget they would want to work with us, if they have a dedicated service provider they are already partnering with. We have some exceptional providers in our communities already. They would be working with those experts to develop the budget and how much it would cost to provide this level of service at their developments. That is why they would be applying for the grant. They would have a budget. They would request that particular resource from the Housing Division. That is also where the partnership with the Interagency Council on Homelessness to Housing would come in, because that body has expertise from people with lived experience and from the Department of Health and Human Services. It can help ensure we are meeting the needs of tenants.

Assemblyman D'Silva:

What would the outreach look like, especially during the pre-tenancy time frame? What kind of outreach would you be doing, and how does it benefit these individuals?

Brooke Page:

Currently, a lot of our outreach efforts are done in our homeless response system. We have a really sophisticated system already set up. There is a coordinated entry with a wait list of a significant number of people waiting to be housed. This would provide the housing infrastructure so that system can move. People can move off of those wait lists and into a permanent place to live. This is not federal funding, but we can create pathways and define whether coordinated entry is one path or if there are other paths we need to create. That is something important for the design of who is applying for this grant, to help inform the Housing Division how they are going to find the tenants and make sure the right people who

need this level of intervention are getting access. It is going to be the onus of that program and application to make that business case.

Assemblyman Nguyen:

Thank you for bringing this very complex issue up. I am sitting here going, I thought I learned something—then wait, hold on, that is another thing I am learning. That shows we still need a lot of education around this topic and around how we can support our community this way. For understanding how we provide these much-needed services, does the case management you listed in the bill include family services? I know from when we got into supportive services that there are two sometimes separate, but equally important, services. Social services and family services do different things. In terms of the family services you were thinking of for this particular project, how do those help the families, especially folks with situations that may be affected by custody cases or CPS [Child Protective Services] issues? In my day job, we got into housing services. We quickly backed out of it, because we got overwhelmed quickly. I know family services are a critical component in this environment, and those family units do not often get talked about. If you could go into that, that would be awesome.

Brooke Page:

This is a really important piece of this bill too, because there are already service providers working with families. They understand the nuances and the needs of our families and our communities. We would hope the developers of this housing are working with those experts to design a grant application to meet the needs of a family development. Say there is a family community, and that community wants to focus on people in the child welfare system. We hope, then, the service provider would link up with the developer, and they would develop an application to apply for this grant program—this being inclusive to all populations that need this level of intervention. If there is a veteran project, we would hope the veteran experts are working with the developer to develop a veteran project application to apply for this funding, and so on. It does not necessarily mean the funds need to define what that looks like, but the community needs to tell us what they need so it can be funded.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

What you said is spot-on. This is a complicated issue we do not have one solution for. It is going to take a multitude of solutions. Assembly Bill 310 is one part of the solution to the problems we see going on in our community.

Chair Torres:

To clarify, the Division would be responsible for creating the eligibility requirements. Even though this particular bill does not say, These are the expectations of the housing projects we are going to have, the Division is going to lay that out. After the passage of this bill, they would create those regulations and policies.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

Correct.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

For my constituents, thank you for being ready to support our community. You explained that if it was a veterans' issue, the developer would have housing for the veterans. Being in Assembly District 17, which has a number of veterans in the community, I was wondering if developers would look at housing those veterans who may need housing and wraparound services.

Brooke Page:

I think that is an excellent example—a developer taking time to assess where the need is, working with our service providers who specialize in veterans' services, and developing a program in a district that needs that level of service. The onus would be on our community to define where and what that partnership looks like and to then bring that package and request to apply. That is an important example. We would want to advocate for that type of program in a district that has a military base close, and things like that.

Assemblywoman González:

I had a quick question. We began the presentation talking about affordable housing and who qualifies. Then we got into wraparound services for people who need a little more help. I wanted to clarify what population this would serve. Also, because this is a grant, what are the guardrails in place to make sure this is happening? Who is overseeing that? Who is making sure these developers are not hiking up prices and things like that?

Christine Hess:

One of the most important factors is, this fund would be housed in the Housing Division. They are currently managing our assets, our inventory of 37,000 units. They have a compliance team in place that monitors the income restrictions already. They have those relationships already. As I consider the public funds and the guardrails you spoke about, I think that is one of the things the Legislature could feel confident on. I do, as I consider these funds. I apologize; I went right to the second part of your question.

Assemblywoman González:

With these complex bills, we do not always know if we are in the weeds, so I appreciate that. The first question was about the population. When we say "affordable housing", right now I do not live in an affordable housing unit. My rent is more than 50 percent of what I am making, but I do not feel I would qualify in the parameters that were set forth. I wanted clarity on what the specific population we are seeking to assist is when we talk about that.

Brooke Page:

In the conceptual amendment, there is a definition of "supportive housing" [page 5, [Exhibit F](#)]. In there, we talk about people who have experienced homelessness, are at risk of experiencing homelessness, or are experiencing inappropriate institutionalization because there is not this type of housing set up in our community. The details of what that means would be at the discretion of the community that is defining their program and the population they are serving. They would hopefully fall within the definition of "supportive housing" and the criteria, but they would determine what that eligibility looks like.

Chair Torres:

I have one additional question. The more that we talk about it, the more we are looking at the parameters and the impact. What if the housing is developed and they receive this grant? Once the grant funding is done, what ends up happening to this housing? My concern would be, say we get this done this session. If these funds are not available, are there any safeguards in place? After these services have been provided, what happens to the tenants if we can no longer provide those services? That is my question, because we give the money to the developers to provide these services.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

Can I clarify what I think you said? There is an appropriated amount within the bill. You are saying, Once that money runs out, what would happen?

Chair Torres:

Yes. Say I am a developer. I get \$1 million to provide these services in my complex. After two years, if this grant is not available for me to reapply, what now happens to the tenants who are there? Maybe I apply, and I do not get the grants. What does that look like in the long run, or what commitment do the developers have to providing those services after they have received those funds? Maybe this is a question we do not have an answer to right now. This is just a consideration.

Brooke Page:

It is an excellent question. This bill provides the infrastructure to start this work and get it in a place where we can demonstrate the effectiveness of what we are not doing. Something Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno also put into this bill is the importance of leveraging other resources. Not only is it hopefully going to be seeded by the Legislature, but there are also philanthropic dollars. There are other funding sources and contributors that can contribute to this fund as well. We could be leveraging other federal resources we are not leveraging right now, because we do not have the infrastructure for this. There are a lot of opportunities for us to grow and scale, but we need data, and we need to be able to demonstrate the effectiveness of this in order to make that argument.

Chair Torres:

Members, I do not see any additional questions. We will now invite anyone wishing to testify in support of [A.B. 310](#).

Christine Hess:

I have a letter of support [[Exhibit H](#)] we have received sign-ons for. For the sake of time, I do not know if you would like me to read the letter. At this point, we have 64 signatures collected in just the last day. It is very exciting. What would your preference be?

Chair Torres:

If we could have the letter submitted to Ms. Judi Bishop, our committee manager, she will make sure that letter goes out and is passed on to all of our members.

Christine Hess:

May I read the names of those who signed on, for the record?

Chair Torres:

Go ahead.

Christine Hess:

Again, this is a sign-on letter of support for Assembly Bill 310. We put this out yesterday morning at around 9 a.m. We have 64 sign-ons [reading from [Exhibit H](#)]:

Landon Hester, MD
Chico Clark, Oikos Development Corporation
Ariel Martinez, APMBiz Consulting
BJ Wright, Coordinated Living of Southern Nevada
Iris Jehle-Peppard, One Truckee River
Jackie Rhea, Advocates to End Domestic Violence, Carson City, Nevada
Jorge Castillon, Aid of AIDS Nevada
Charity Cage
Michelle Johnston, U.S. VETS-Las Vegas, Nevada
Brandon Gaeta, Northern Nevada HOPES
Howard Wesley Bills, Fallon Community Alliance
Monica DuPea, Nevada Youth Empowerment Project, Truckee Meadows
Housing Solutions
Donica Martinez, SONV Lived X Consultant
Martin Castro, HOME Team City of North Las Vegas, Nevada
Dani Sparks, HopeLink of Southern Nevada
Danielle Herrera-Markwald, Accessible Space, Inc.
Frances Alling
Kristin Aviles
Jonathan Norman, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Donald Miller, HopeLink of Southern Nevada
Eric Novak, Praxis Consulting Group, LLC
Dedra Edmond-Drew, Black Silk Developments, LLC
Breja Thomas, Nevada Homeless Alliance
Pamela Horsford
Hilary Lopez, Ph.D., City of Reno Housing Authority
Krystal Griffin, SN Health Consortium member and advocate
Blake Leavitt, Blake Realty Ventures LLC
Catrina Grigsby-Thedford, Nevada Homeless Alliance
Julia Occhiogrosso
Hassan Chaudhry, Foresight Housing Partners, Inc.
Pastor Eve Williams, Advent United Methodist Church
Maurice Page, Page Strategic Solutions LLC
Anthony Kazee
Keith Tamura, Brazen Architecture

Virginia DeVito, Advent United Methodist Church
Trevor Macaluso, Chief Executive Officer, Eddy House
Alejandra Fazekas
Juawana Grant
Eileen Bidwell
Lorri Murphy, Ovation Development
Benjamin Castro, The Reno Initiative for Shelter and Equality
Jessica Medina, NAMI Southern Nevada
Louis Hixson, Chicanos Por La Causa Nevada
Cynthia Watson Catha, Impact Exchange
Nevada HAND
Dr. M. Christopher Brown II, Nevada Partners
Jerry Kappeler, Accessible Space Inc.
Christine Saunders, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Timothy Doyle
Booker Reid
Brent Lovett, Lyon Modular Sustainable Workforce Housing
Angela Phillips, Habitat for Humanity Las Vegas
Serena Evans, Policy Director, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual
Violence
Adam Bentley Clausen, Rise Village Qualified Opportunity Zone Fund
Brooke Page, CSH
Martin Montgomery, Executive Director, Washoe Housing Authority
Ken Berry, Accessible Space, Inc.
Sheila Cohen, VETS365
Stacey Lockhart, CEO, HopeLink of Southern Nevada
Aaron West, NVO Construction
Ashlee Cooper, Opportunity Village
Fuilala Riley, HELP of Southern Nevada
Yvette Myers, The Empowerment Center
Christine Hess

Dan Musgrove, representing SafeNest; Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow; and WestCare Foundation:

We at Strategies 360 are very proud to represent a number of nonprofits that will be positively impacted by this legislation, whether it is SafeNest, whose mission is to help those impacted by domestic and sexual violence; the Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow, a job-creating, job-training nonprofit that lifts people out of poverty; or WestCare Foundation, which is working to raise money right now to build supportive housing for the women and children who are going through their substance abuse program in Las Vegas.

There may maybe a couple of you on this Committee who realized I also do a lot of work in mental health as the immediate past chair of the Clark County Children's Mental Health Consortium, which is a legislatively created committee. I work in mental health. If I can leave you with one thought today, think about all the other things that may happen to a

person in their life. One of the important tenets of trauma-informed care is looking at a person from the aspect of not "what is wrong with you" but "what has happened to you?" Imagine the impact of being unhoused on a child or an adult and the trauma that causes. We have to realize that being without a safe place to live is very traumatic for both adults and children. What this bill talks about today are those supportive services that go along with helping those people move forward. Obviously, I and all of my clients support this legislation.

Amy Shogren, representing the Vegas Chamber:

We are in full support of this bill and the positive impact it will have.

Kennedy McKinney, representing Nevada Women's Lobby; and the Human Services Network:

Stable housing is a critical foundational element to help support individuals in finding and holding steady employment, addressing struggles with addiction, and protecting individuals from all forms of violence. We know housing is a key legislative priority. Daily, we are faced with a lack of affordable and attainable housing throughout Nevada. This bill is an important step to help provide a resource to homeless populations and ultimately support them in getting off the street and staying off the streets. We urge you to support A.B. 310.

Kelly Crompton, Government Affairs Manager, City of Las Vegas:

The City of Las Vegas supports the development and implementation of a supportive housing grant program, as it helps people stay housed, get healthy, and build the skills they need to live independently. Supportive housing allows the constituents we serve obtain much-needed services while they are being safely housed. We are in support of the provisions of supportive services, case management, and supportive housing assistance to low-income persons through CDBG [Community Development Block Grant] funding, ESG [Environmental, Social, and Governance] funding, the HOME Investment Partnership Program, and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS funding. We look forward to working with the community to bring this bill.

John Norman, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

Ditto. This is a real solution, and it is appreciated.

Paul Catha, Political Director, Culinary Workers Union Local 226:

We support Assembly Bill 310. I learned from Ms. Hess's testimony that apparently, my mother also supports the bill. I would like to echo everyone's comments. Ditto.

Ashley Garza Kennedy, Principal Management Analyst, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County:

I will be brief and say we are in support of the bill. Our board and our leadership have prioritized housing at all levels over the years, and we have successfully partnered with the state in these efforts. We hope this fund will give us additional opportunities to work towards the goal of moving our communities towards stable housing solutions.

Joelle Gutman Dodson, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County Health District:

I am here today in strong support of A.B. 310. Permanent supportive housing is a piece of Washoe County's community improvement plan for how we address issues in our community. On a personal note, in a past life, I was a case manager for unhoused individuals. Looking them in the eye and telling them they are number 500 on the waiting list for when they can get housing is truly awful. This evidence-based supportive housing that helps people keep their medication, keep them employed, and keep them in touch with who they need to be in touch with is so important.

Eva Black, representing SilverSummit HealthPlan:

As a Medicaid insurer, every day, we see firsthand the urgent need for more housing for those on extremely low incomes. With the passage of A.B. 310, Nevada can begin to leverage the game-changing opportunities presented by supportive housing availability, evaluate and track those being served, and take advantage of federal funding that is currently being left on the table. Investing in supportive housing and the supportive housing development fund is a win for Nevadans in need, and a fiscal win for our public dollars as time and again, communities show the cost of homelessness is higher than the cost of stable housing. We ask you to join us in supporting this bill.

Elyse Monroy-Marsala, representing National Alliance on Mental Illness-Nevada Chapter:

The National Alliance on Mental Health is excited and hopeful about the appropriation proposal, as well as the possibilities this could bring for supportive housing and the mental health community.

Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County:

Washoe County is here in support of this bill. I will not reiterate all the great reasons you have already heard for the bill this morning, but I do want to emphasize what you heard from Ms. Page about how much smarter these dollars work. We want our dollars to work smarter, not harder. The return on investment for these dollars is so much higher than other alternatives for where these people are receiving treatment. Currently, we urge your support.

Nicole Rourke, Director of Government and Public Affairs, City of Henderson:

I will echo the comments of the colleague before me and say we support A.B. 310. We think this is important legislation and urge your support.

Roxanne DeCarlo, Executive Director, The Empowerment Center, Reno, Nevada:

The Empowerment Center is a nonprofit organization. We provide transitional housing and support services to women who suffer from a substance use disorder. Several years ago, we recognized that individuals who were completing our program were struggling to find housing that fit their new lifestyle. There is nothing more heartbreaking than watching a woman work super hard to change her life and then end up back in a weekly motel or an unhealthy household where drug use and abuse continue. It is only a matter of time before their foundation erodes, and they end up back in the cycle of addiction and back at the Empowerment Center, right where it all began.

I am excited to say, in November of last year, the Empowerment Center opened up the first affordable permanent supportive housing in Nevada for individuals in early recovery from a substance use disorder. The Marvel Way Complex is a 42-unit affordable housing complex that provides next steps to those in early recovery, allowing individuals to dictate the length of time and support they need. Within two weeks of opening the application process, there were 160 applications received. There are currently 200 people on that waiting list. In a few short months, we will break ground on Phase Two, adding a much-needed additional 45 units to this complex. The Empowerment Center is incredibly grateful to the funding provided for the actual building.

Chair Torres:

Can you wrap up your testimony? Any written remarks can be sent to our Committee Manager.

Roxanne DeCarlo:

We are grateful for the funding that was received to build the building. We built it using funding that came from the county, the city, and the state. Phase Two is funded through the Home Means Nevada fund. The problem being talked about here today is the support systems that are made available to the actual building once it is built. For my building, our project, we do not need a ton of support funding. I would say about \$100,000 a year would cover the support systems. We need one employee to manage those support systems.

Chair Torres:

Please make sure all your written remarks are submitted. We have several other individuals here to testify in support, and we all have to get to floor soon. We appreciate it, and we look forward to reading your testimony.

Marlene Lockard, representing Service Employees International Union Local 1107:

For all the very positive, wonderful things that have been said, we too support this important legislation.

Lea Case, representing Children's Advocacy Alliance:

I will take a note out of my mentor, Marlene Lockard's book and say ditto.

Arielle Edwards, Director of Government Relations, Nevada HAND, Las Vegas, Nevada:

We are grateful for this piece of legislation. We are in full support of A.B. 310. We urge its passage.

John Sande IV, representing Nevada State Apartment Association:

This is a great piece of legislation. As my grandmother always told me, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. That is very true for this bill.

Nick Vander Poel, representing Nevada Rural Housing Authority:

The executive director of Nevada Rural Housing Authority, William Brewer, was in the audience but had to leave for another meeting. We are here in support.

Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am a psychiatrist. The first name mentioned of the 62 was one of my residents. I am very proud of him for being an intern and politically active already. This housing issue is so broad, it actually changes length of stay and how much medication somebody can have when they leave the hospital. You do not realize that, but if there is an unstable housing situation, I cannot discharge somebody from a state hospital. Also, I cannot give them a 30-day supply of medicine if I do not know where they are going to live. This would address a number of issues and allow us to provide more comprehensive care and reduced length of stay. It plays off the 9 days in the ER equals 3 months in jail equals the cost of a year's worth of housing formula. This is a better way to do it. My grandmother said the same thing: An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Amen.

Keith Lynam, Chairman, Nevada REALTORS Legislative Committee:

We are in complete support. I want to make sure we thank the sponsor for bringing this well-thought-out solution to supportive housing. As you all know, it is our top legislative priority to have affordable, attainable housing.

Mackenzie Warren Kay, representing Southern Nevada Home Builders Association; and Ovation Development Corporation:

Southern Nevada Home Builders Association supports A.B. 310. It provides a key ingredient of something that has been missing in the affordable housing discussion. It is our hope that we bring more developers into the supportive housing front with this bill. For Ovation Development, A.B. 310 hits particularly close to home. Ovation has a supportive housing project currently in the zoning phase. Assembly Bill 310 will hopefully pave the way for more developers to start building affordable housing that includes those wraparound supportive services. We urge your support.

Jarron Gray, Board Chair, Urban Chamber of Commerce, Las Vegas, Nevada:

We are in support of A.B. 310. We recognize how important it is to have affordable housing and solve the housing equation for our small business members who are not able to pay a livable wage in some cases. Solving that equation is very important for not only our members, but for our community as well.

Emily Paulsen, Board Member, Nevada Housing Coalition:

I am a social worker with more than 15 years of service to our homeless community in Nevada. Eight of those years have been spent implementing, managing, and directly providing services in supportive housing. What I can tell you from this experience is that supportive housing works. Supportive housing transforms lives and ends the cycle of homelessness for our most vulnerable population. You do not have to take my word for it. This is an evidence-based intervention proven to not only provide a pathway out of

homelessness, but keep people stable housed, improve their health outcomes, and save public resources on avoidable downstream costs of homelessness. We urge your support of this bill.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford, Executive Director, Nevada Homeless Alliance, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I see, and I am sure most people in the room see, the increase in homelessness. I also happen to see this up close and personal, as we have events targeting individuals who are unsheltered and homeless. I am a licensed social worker and a certified drug and alcohol counselor. On top of that, I am a person with lived experience of homelessness, substance use, and justice involvement. Assembly Bill 310 is needed in our community. Permanent supportive housing increases housing stability. It also improves health. It is very cost-effective when you think of the public cost associated with use of shelters, hospitals, behavioral health agencies, and jails. Our most vulnerable homeless neighbors have high needs, and we must realize that refugee housing is not a one-size-fits-all for our homeless neighbors. We are finding that many are in need of more person-centered, longer-term services. Our community is behind the ball in comparison to other communities, and A.B. 310 is one step in the right direction.

[[Exhibit I](#), [Exhibit J](#), [Exhibit K](#), and [Exhibit L](#) were submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Chair Torres:

Can we get the next caller in support of A.B. 310? [There was no one.] Is anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 310? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 310? [There was no one.]

Are there any closing remarks from the bill sponsor?

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for listening to the presentation and hearing the vast amount of support for Assembly Bill 310. There is not much more that I can say than you have already heard. There is a need in our state. This is just one solution to so many of the needs we have. I urge your support.

Chair Torres:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 310 and move on to public comment. Does anyone else wish to testify in public comment? [There was no one.] Members, are there any comments?

Assemblywoman Thomas:

I wanted to say, this was one of the reasons I wanted to be an assemblywoman for the state of Nevada and for my community—to hear good bills come across that we can support.

Chair Torres:

Members, any additional comments? [There were none.] I wanted to acknowledge something, because we failed to do so yesterday. I will take full responsibility for that.

Yesterday was actually a holiday in this Committee, and we failed to note that. Our Committee Assistant, Ms. Cheryl Williams, celebrated her 21st birthday yet again—25th? She is at least 25.

We wanted to make sure the record reflected how much we appreciate all Ms. Williams does. I have had the pleasure of knowing Ms. Williams since I was a freshman legislator in 2019. She always has a smile on her face. She wants to talk to everybody. She loves diet sodas, so if you have any in your office and you see her walking by, throw her one and she will take it. She likes to go out dancing. She loves her horses, and she loves her grandkids. Most of all, she loves spending time here the in the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs. Let the record reflect that Ms. Cheryl Williams' favorite committee is the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs.

Assemblywoman Duran:

Yes, she is amazing. I met her in 2019 as well. She has always welcomed everybody with open arms. She is willing to help anybody out and is very caring and loving. I want to say, there are not too many people like you. God bless. I hope you enjoyed your birthday.

Chair Torres:

Today, we will adjourn the Committee in honor of our good friend, Ms. Cheryl Williams [at 11:12 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lindsey Howell
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 214](#), submitted by Michael Hillerby, representing Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 214](#), submitted by Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson, Assembly District No. 30.

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter dated March 22, 2023, submitted by Olivia Tanager, Program Manager-Environmental Justice, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 214](#).

[Exhibit F](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 310](#), presented by Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1.

[Exhibit G](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Nevada Supportive Housing Development Fund: AB310 Presentation," dated March 23, 2023, presented by Brooke Page, Director-Southwest, Corporation for Supportive Housing, and Christine Hess, Executive Director, Nevada Housing Coalition.

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter dated March 23, 2023, submitted by Christine Hess, Executive Director, Nevada Housing Coalition, in support of [Assembly Bill 310](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is a document titled "Nevada Supportive Housing Development Fund: Purpose Driven Housing," submitted by Brooke Page, Director-Southwest, Corporation for Supportive Housing, regarding [Assembly Bill 310](#).

[Exhibit J](#) is a letter dated March 23, 2023, submitted by Donald Miller, Outreach Manager, HopeLink of Southern Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 310](#).

[Exhibit K](#) is a letter dated March 23, 2023, submitted by Ashlee Cooper, Manager of Advocacy and Government Affairs, Opportunity Village, Las Vegas, Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 310](#).

[Exhibit L](#) is a letter dated March 23, 2023, submitted by Serena Evans, Policy Director, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence, in support of [Assembly Bill 310](#).