

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

**Eighty-Second Session
May 18, 2023**

The Committee on Ways and Means was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 8:08 a.m. on Thursday, May 18, 2023, in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 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 Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair
Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman
Assemblywoman Michelle Gorelow
Assemblyman Gregory T. Hafen II
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama
Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblyman Howard Watts
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Brody Leiser, Assembly Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Anne Bowen, Committee Secretary
Janet Osalvo, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Fergus Laughridge, Chair, Rural Regional Behavioral Health Policy Board; Health Director, Fort McDermitt Tribal Wellness Center
Andrew Clinger, Chief Financial Officer, Nevada System of Higher Education
Sara Hunt, Assistant Dean of Behavioral Health Sciences, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health, Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Director, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Mental and Behavioral Health Training Coalition
Kanani Espinoza, representing University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Blayne Osborn, President, Nevada Rural Hospital Partners
Robin V. Reedy, Executive Director, NAMI Nevada, National Alliance on Mental Illness
Sheila Bray, Community Partnerships Coordinator for Clark County Extension, University of Nevada, Reno
Elyse Monroy-Marsala, representing Nevada Public Health Association
Morgan Biaselli, representing Vitality Unlimited; New Frontier Treatment Center; Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation; and Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation
Zoë Houghton, representing MedX AirOne
Oscar Sida, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Steve Messinger, representing Nevada Primary Care Association
Laurie Drucker, representing Nevada Psychological Association
Kirk Widmar, Chief, Offender Management, Department of Corrections
Richard Whitley, Director, Department of Health and Human Services
Lynnette Aaron, Administrative Services Officer 4, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services
Valerie Haskin, Coordinator, Rural Regional Behavioral Health
JoAnn Malay, MPH, RN, Deputy Administrator, Clinical Services and Mental Health, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services
James M. Humm, Director, Public Policy and Government Affairs, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor
Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Research and Project Management Division, Department of Motor Vehicles

John Borrowman, Chief Financial Officer, Division of Public and Behavioral Health,
Department of Health and Human Services
Lisa Swearingen, Deputy Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive
Services, Department of Health and Human Services

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

[Roll was taken and Committee rules and protocols were explained.] Good morning and welcome to the Committee on Ways and Means. On our agenda, we have Assembly Bill 386 (1st Reprint). That bill will not be heard today—it is being rescheduled. We will begin with Assembly Bill 37.

Assembly Bill 386 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to midwives. (BDR 54-111)

[Assembly Bill 386 (1st Reprint) was agendized but not heard.]

Assembly Bill 37: Authorizes the establishment of the Behavioral Health Workforce Development Center of Nevada. (BDR 34-361)

Fergus Laughridge, Chair, Rural Regional Behavioral Health Policy Board; Health Director, Fort McDermitt Tribal Wellness Center:

We brought forth Assembly Bill 37; it was heard before the policy committee, passed unanimously without amendments, received bipartisan support throughout, and there was great conversation regarding this bill. In summary, A.B. 37 provides for the establishment of the Behavioral Health Workforce Center of Nevada. As we know, behavioral health is in a crisis in the state of Nevada. May is Behavioral Health Awareness Month, so it is timely that this bill was heard today before this Committee. Behavioral health is in crisis, and if we do not do something now, we will be continually having these discussions.

This Center will provide for the establishment of a Behavioral Health Workforce Development Center, located within the Nevada System of Higher Education, working out to the area in regional spokes—a hub-and-spoke model. It is important to know that this is not brick and mortar; this is for personnel costs to get things done now, and to build on to the future. With that, I have Andrew Clinger with us to address the fiscal note implications.

Andrew Clinger, Chief Financial Officer, Nevada System of Higher Education:

We worked with the bill sponsors, Dr. Sarah Hunt and Fergus Laughridge to put together this fiscal note. I would say, first of all, the timing of us learning of this was unfortunate, because I think if the Chancellor had known about this earlier, he probably would have recommended it be included in our budget request. As Fergus Laughridge stated, this authorizes the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada to establish a Workforce Development Center with a main hub. The fiscal note before you has been revised to adjust the start date on the positions from July to October. It totals approximately \$2.1 million over the upcoming biennium, with eight positions in fiscal year (FY) 2024, plus an additional two positions in FY 2025, and associated operating costs.

I know one of the questions that has come up is where do we appropriate the money? I think there are several options. One of the options is to appropriate it to System Administration within the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), and once the Board goes through the process of establishing the center and establishing the main hub, we could allocate it out to whatever institution was determined to be the main hub. I think the other alternative would be to appropriate the funds to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC), and once the Board makes those determinations, we could certainly come back and request the money that way. I think we are flexible if the Committee is inclined to add funding for this.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for the presentation. So, not a brick and mortar. Looking at the fiscal note, it is personnel. The expense would be with the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) budget, but personnel would work all over the state, correct?

Andrew Clinger:

That is my understanding. Under the model of the way I would envision it, all of the funding would be allocated to wherever the hub is, and as they determine where they need positions, the hub could then allocate funds out to the various regions for personnel and other operating costs.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions? You should have the updated fiscal note on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. It is just a few pages, and it breaks down the personnel costs for FY 2024 and operating costs for FY 2024 and FY 2025.

Assemblywoman Peters:

Thank you for this bill. I think it is a novel concept, and I appreciate it. I do envy UNLV being the host of this because I think it would be lovely to have this work being done in the north as well. I have a couple questions related to the size of this initial staffing. Does NSHE have other programs that are related to workforce development that is comparable in size and development as what is suggested in this fiscal note?

Andrew Clinger:

System Administration has a couple of workforce development positions, but in this case, these positions are serving a very specific purpose related to behavioral health. We certainly do not currently have anyone in our office with that expertise. We do have people who work on general workforce development, but nothing this specific. Dr. Hunt and others may want to add to that.

Assemblywoman Peters:

To clarify, I am not specifically asking about behavioral health, but any other workforce, such as diversity workforce, or any other system of this size.

Andrew Clinger:

There is nothing of this size currently in System Administration. As I said, we only have a few positions currently in the office. Actually, not even a few that work on just workforce broadly across the entire system.

Assemblywoman Peters:

The other question I have is related to the operating cost recommendations in the bill. The out-of-state travel and the consultation and technical assistance line items are both \$20,000. Can you talk about how you came up with that dollar amount?

Andrew Clinger:

I am going to defer to Dr. Hunt. I know she worked with our staff very closely on this.

Sara Hunt, Assistant Dean of Behavioral Health Sciences, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Health, Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Director, University of Nevada, Las Vegas Mental and Behavioral Health and Training Coalition:

The out-of-state travel and consultation are for connecting with two similar programs that exist in other states. In policy committee meetings we mentioned that this proposed center is based on a model that has been in existence under the University of Nebraska and began in Nebraska. It would be consultation with that center as well as a new center that just started in Illinois. Through legislative action, Illinois was able to stand up their center this year. Both have very similar hub-and-spoke models but approach their workforce development initiatives differently. The travel cost would be to go out and visit with them, especially the center in Nebraska, since they have been in existence for over ten years. We really want to talk with them further about what has been successful, go on site, and see some of the programming and outreach they do.

Assemblywoman Peters:

For clarification on the consultation and technical assistance—you expect to contract with somebody—is that what that line item is for?

Sara Hunt:

There would be a consultation and probably a contract for consultation and technical assistance with the center in Nebraska, since they are the longest standing program.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I would like to see more of a breakdown on these travel costs; \$20,000 for travel to two sites seems like a lot. I would like to know the expectation for the team and some cost breakdowns, as well.

Sara Hunt:

We can work on that.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions on this bill or the amended fiscal note? Seeing none, we will invite testimony in support of Assembly Bill 37.

Kanani Espinoza, representing University of Nevada, Las Vegas:

The UNLV is ecstatic to be the behavioral health hub for this program, and look forward to providing behavioral health services throughout Nevada.

Blayne Osborn, President, Nevada Rural Hospital Partners:

Nevada Rural Hospital Partners actually employs two of these regional behavioral health policy coordinators, and we could not be more thrilled to support this bill.

Robin V. Reedy, Executive Director, NAMI Nevada, National Alliance on Mental Illness:

Very simply, I am here to support this bill. Is it worth the money? Absolutely. We are rated pretty much last, and one of the parameters that are measured against is our providers, and the available providers in the psychiatric field. So please, we support this bill.

Sheila Bray, Community Partnerships Coordinator for Clark County Extension, University of Nevada Reno:

We are in full support of A.B. 37. As we all know, there is a large shortage of behavioral health workforce across our state, and we are excited to work with our partners to help identify this issue.

Elyse Monroy-Marsala, representing the Nevada Public Health Association:

We are in strong support of A.B. 37. I know this is not a policy committee, but one of the things I will say is, I think this is a cost effective and innovative way to approach sustainable workforce development. On one end, A.B. 37 creates a workforce pipeline, but on the other end supports providers in all the things they need to do to sustain their businesses. When we think about what a provider learns in school, they learn how to provide good patient care; they do not learn how to navigate billing and how to run a business. This bill, and the program that was developed, has been really thoughtful in the way that it is approaching those things. I think A.B. 37 will be worth any dollar that we can put into it. We urge your support.

Morgan Biaselli, representing Vitality Unlimited; and New Frontier Treatment Center:

I am representing Vitality Unlimited and New Frontier Treatment Center. We strongly support this bill and see it as rural Nevada's best opportunity to attract a whole range of behavioral health professionals to help us grow on our own.

Zoë Houghton, representing MedX AirOne:

I am here on behalf of MedX AirOne; an emergency air ambulance service and ground service that serves the rural areas of the state. We are in strong support of A.B. 37. We first heard about the rural behavioral workforce health model at our mental health summit focused

on rural areas last year. We found it to be a really robust discussion, and a lot of support was built in the rural areas, and we think this would help address the mental health issues that are found in the rural areas. Thank you, and we urge your support.

Oscar Sida, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am very excited about the prospects of this bill and how it can help develop workforce, especially related to substance abuse counseling. I guess the intent is that the main hub will be at UNLV, but the overarching theme is to support rural workforce development. When you grow professionals in their locales, their hometowns, their native lands, they tend to stay and work there if they are educated there. Great Basin College has a number of programs in the rural communities. We have centers in Winnemucca, our main campus in Elko, and I work out of the Pahrump office. I would like to ensure that when this plan is developed, we have resources allocated that are equitable and serve the mission. I see too many projects spend a lot of money, but they do not get anywhere. I would hate to see that happen, because the rural communities desperately need this. Our programs have a number of students working in the rural communities, and this initiative can really bring in more students who are interested in health care and also establish the future workforce in mental health, substance abuse, and ancillary professions.

Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Good morning, Madam Chair and members of the Committee. Thank you and yield.

Steve Messinger, representing Nevada Primary Care Association:

We hear about behavioral health workforce challenges every single day, and there is a growing need among our more than 100,000 patients in Nevada. We support [A.B. 37](#) fully and hope you do, too. Thank you.

Laurie Drucker, representing Nevada Psychological Association:

We represent approximately half of the psychologists in the state, and our members work for the state and the universities, medical centers, hospitals, community behavioral health centers, and in private practice. As you are all aware, Nevada ranks at the bottom of the nation for the number of mental and behavioral health care providers per capita. Recruiting and retaining providers is the critical need in our state. We have already submitted written testimony in support for [A.B. 37](#). I am here today to support Nevada's investment in this innovative program. Not only does this program create a pipeline to train and retain mental health providers such as psychologists, but it also offers education about mental health care and supports increased access care for all Nevadans. Thank you for your consideration of this important legislation.

[[Exhibit C](#), [Exhibit D](#), [Exhibit E](#), [Exhibit F](#), [Exhibit G](#), and [Exhibit H](#) were not discussed but were submitted in support of [Assembly Bill 37](#) and will become part of the record.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 37? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] I would ask the presenters to come back up to the table.

Mr. Clinger, you said something during your presentation that it might be best to put the money in the IFC Contingency Account. I agree with you. There was a question from Assemblywoman Peters about the travel—please get that information back to us. To receive the funding—bring the final plan so we know what this is going to be. Then getting the funding from the IFC Contingency Account—is that something you could be agreeable to?

Andrew Clinger:

Yes, that would be great. Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 37 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 125 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 125 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public safety. (BDR 43-796)

Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Assembly District No. 37:

As most of you probably know, I am also a citizen of the Cherokee Nation. Today, it is my pleasure to present the money side of Assembly Bill 125 (1st Reprint), which is intended to address missing and murdered Indigenous persons. For background, A.B. 125 (R1) essentially does three things. First, the bill provides that the tribal liaison for the Department of Public Safety is to also maintain communications related to missing and murdered Indigenous persons between the Department and Indian tribes and tribal communities in our state, tribal organizations, urban Indian organizations, other tribal liaisons designated by state agencies, and nongovernmental entities that provide services to women who are members of Indian tribes.

Second, A.B. 125 (R1) is intended to ensure that Indigenous adult persons who go missing are captured in the National Crime Information Center (NCIC), which is a computerized index of criminal justice information including missing persons that is accessible by federal, state, and local law enforcement. In light of some concerns expressed by local law enforcement, the mandatory language was changed to permissive in the first reprint.

Third, A.B. 125 (R1) includes a provision for peace officers to receive training in taking reports in handling of cases related to missing Indigenous persons. For a deeper dive into federal Indian law and criminal jurisdiction, I welcome you to watch the policy hearing held in the Assembly Committee on Judiciary on March 6, 2023. In light of some of the fiscal notes attached to this bill, I want to express that I have continued to work with stakeholders to iron out some of the issues presented in this bill. One of the main things is obviously the training in Peace Officers' Standards and Training Commission (POST), and some of the

criticism was about the overbroad language. I have been seeking more specific language, because most law enforcement already trains with respect to understanding tribal sovereignty and working around our tribal nations as well as dealing with reports of missing persons. I had a lot of help from the Department of Public Safety early on concerning what those reports would look like and how they would be taken. I cannot imagine too much work—maybe like a one pager—with respect to putting information into a miscellaneous code. I believe the first fiscal note had no money for POST, but I am following up with that to just make sure we are not putting too much more work on our law enforcement, with respect to training, but making sure some of these crucial issues are being addressed.

Next is the investigators side. We do have an amended fiscal note that provides a position amounting to \$226,296. I am not sure if all of you are aware, but Nevada law already provides for a liaison for our tribes in most of our agencies, including the Department of Public Safety. However, I think I am getting linked in with a wonderful bill, and I think it is a great bill. It is Senate Bill 94 that is going to be heard in Senate Finance tomorrow that adds a lengthy list of items for our tribal liaisons. You will notice at the bottom of the fiscal note, when you take that along with the additional mandates that I have put on in the first part of A.B. 125 (R1), there was an ask for an additional position. I stand ready to answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for your presentation and for your work on this bill. Senate Bill 94 is scheduled to be heard tomorrow, and the investigator in your bill would be included in that bill?

Assemblywoman Backus:

No, what happened was when they prepared the fiscal note—right now every agency already has a tribal liaison—however, with the expanded scope of duties being set forth in A.B. 125 (R1) and S.B. 94—Senate Bill 94 has quite a lengthy number of items compared to A.B. 125 (R1)—I received the amended fiscal note for the additional position.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for that clarification.

Assemblyman Hafen:

I know you and I have talked about this and the importance of this, with the change to permissive on the NCIC; is that going to address the federal concerns that were brought forward?

Assemblywoman Backus:

I am still working on this and for those on the policy side, the permissive language was put in there because I have the support of the Department of Public Safety to be able to take reports. However, some local law enforcement agencies are pushing back with respect to being able to take a report into NCIC. We are able to expand it and reprint one, but there are some federal Indian law jurisdictional issues. If someone goes missing under suspicious circumstances, for example, when an officer takes a report into NCIC, technically, within a

short time period, they need to do an investigation. With federal Indian law, they obviously cannot go onto the reservation to do that investigation, so it has created some challenges. I have had the Department of Public Safety come up with another really good idea of how to input the report, almost like a courtesy report.

For those who are not familiar with NCIC, it is a database for when people go missing. The sad reality of it is this helps people when someone who has been murdered shows up and they can identify that person. Most recently, and in the hearing that we had before the Committee on Judiciary, we had the daughter of a woman who was found in her trunk between Reno and Carson City from the Pyramid Lake Indian reservation. That is really the purpose. It has been a struggle. I did permissive, and there is still some work around, and it is a bigger policy issue with this NCIC database because right now we have a variety of people who can take reports. Obviously, the Bureau of Indian Affairs can take a report. The good thing about this bill, and why I think it would be cheaper for us to do is we have learned that tribes can ascertain a grant to get the NCIC database themselves. A lot of our tribes, and tribes that I just assumed had NCIC because they are wealthier tribes, ended up being able to secure it. So, that is a positive. However, we still have rural tribes who do not even have tribal police, and so some law enforcement thought maybe we can take reports for them.

So, thank you, Assemblyman Hafen. I know when I amended it, you also wanted to be a cosponsor and I have not forgotten, but I will continue to work on this issue.

Assemblyman Hafen:

Thank you for that. I was disappointed not to see my name on this. The nonpersonnel section of the fiscal note then is for the NCIC equipment and information technology portion; is that correct? And now that it is being permissive, I would assume that those funds may, or may not, be needed.

Assemblywoman Backus:

I need to follow up with that because there is overlap with Senate Bill 94; NCIC would definitely not be needed for the Department of Public Safety because they already have that.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any other questions? [There were none.]

I invite those who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 125 (1st Reprint) to step up to the table.

Morgan Biaselli, representing Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation; and Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation:

We are here in support of this bill. Thank you.

[[Exhibit I](#) was not discussed but was submitted in support of Assembly Bill 125 (1st Reprint) and will become part of the record.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 125 (1st Reprint)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 125 (1st Reprint)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position on Assembly Bill 125 (1st Reprint)? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 125 (R1) and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 389 (1st Reprint).

Assembly Bill 389 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing Medicaid. (BDR 38-977)

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9:

I will be brief on what this bill does. For purposes of this Committee, Assembly Bill 389 (1st Reprint) requires the Department of Health and Human Services to apply for a waiver. I think that is where we see some of the fiscal costs in the immediate biennium. In terms of what the waiver would allow, it would be a Medicaid waiver that would allow for coverage for certain services to incarcerated youths and certain adults requesting of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) that individuals who are incarcerated and qualify can start to receive treatment 90 days before they are released from custody. There is a procedure in place where they can be qualified at this point, but actually providing those services to be covered by CMS is something that is not allowed unless the state is able to obtain a waiver.

To quickly tell you how that would work on page 2 around line 16 of the bill, it lists those who would qualify to receive services if the waiver were to be granted. If this were granted, those individuals would be covered through Medicaid, and they would be able to receive services before they are released. Those services would include things like case management, consultation with behavioral and physical health care providers, laboratory and radiology services, prescription drug coverage, including for medication-assisted treatment, and assistance through community health workers. People are released from incarceration, and they lose the continuity they had while incarcerated, and are unable to find providers, and sometimes unable to continue their medication. They are given a supply when they leave incarceration, typically, but it can be difficult to find providers in the community that can service them. That is essentially what the bill does.

There are two fiscal notes on the bill in my most recent reading. One is from the Department of Corrections which is unable to determine the fiscal impact, and the other one is from the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services related to the cost of preparing the waiver. I will not say that I have been in contact with them directly, but one of our Committee members, Assemblywoman Peters, has been in contact with them about this fiscal note, and I think there may be another way to go about doing this. I do not want to speak for them because I think they are here and willing and able to talk. I am happy to answer any questions that this Committee may have on the bill itself or on the fiscal notes, as I can try to answer those as well.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Do we know the number of users that this might impact, and do we know how those cases are being handled currently?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I do not have the answer to those questions, unfortunately. I am looking through my notes to see, and I am not sure. My sense is the youth population will be fewer, of course, because we just do not have as many youth incarcerated in the state. There may be some representatives here from the Department of Corrections who are able to answer that, and certainly able and willing to try to get that answer for you.

Kirk Widmar, Chief, Offender Management, Department of Corrections:

Currently, we have 12 youth who would qualify under this program in our system. Since the youth have come to our Department, the average number of youth who have been incarcerated with us, sits at around 18 to 21. That is about the total average population. We have seen as high as 24 and the low has been 8 and that is over the course of the 7 to 8 years that we have incarcerated the youth.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

For these youth offenders to receive the services, are they currently receiving services before they get released and building that relationship? How is that being funded currently?

Kirk Widmar:

Currently, because they are incarcerated, I think we are running into the issue of the need for the waiver. The services that are provided internally related to mental health and medical, of course, to the extent the Department can, we absolutely do. As they release, they, like the adults, are signed up, qualified, with that transition upon release to be engaged in the system. Currently, as we stand, without the passage of this we have that barrier without the waiver.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

If there is a representative from the Department of Health and Human Services who could speak about the fiscal note, that would be wonderful.

Richard Whitley, Director, Department of Health and Human Services:

I have somebody from Medicaid here to talk about the fiscal note. I think to answer your question about the numbers, that would be the point of the waiver that we would apply for. So far, the state of California is the only state that has been approved. There are approximately 12 states that have applications in; Nevada does not have an application yet, but in concept, for a waiver we need to show that we believe we can provide a service better than what is in the current Medicaid plan with a cost neutrality. California was able to show a savings, and although the Department of Corrections spoke about a small denominator of adolescents who are in the adult system, most adolescents who are in our juvenile facilities qualify for Medicaid and upon discharge are provided service that probably has the least amount of gap in it. But the majority is really in the jails and the Department of Corrections for adults when they leave, and that is where California was able to show the savings.

I apologize because I did not answer your question directly, but that was sort of bottled up in me to clarify that. Those of you who have sat on our agency budget may recall that the Fund for a Resilient Nevada, which is the opioid settlement funds—we have not funded fully the resources that were prioritized to go to the criminal justice involvement. Those funds, instead of State General Funds, would be an appropriate funding source. We can get a federal match for those and use it for the state match for federal funds for this waiver. The fiscal note that the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy submitted does indicate General Funds, but we will make a change to that, and we can use opioid settlement funds. The detail is really showing that we can achieve a savings. The biggest gap basically is that people do not have basically enough medication until they get an appointment, and people who have been stabilized often require higher levels of care that are more costly. That really is the point that California made. Probably the jails are going to be more challenging, as most contract with health care, and they would have to become Medicaid providers. Again, more of a response than what you asked for, but we will correct the fiscal note that we have on this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for the additional information. I think that was very helpful for the Committee.

Lynnette Aaron, Administrative Services Officer 4, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services:

We would like to update our fiscal note. The total for the biennium is \$1,911,243. The General Fund portion, which will be replaced with the opioid settlement funds would be \$817,909 and the federal fund portion would be \$1,093,334.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I have written it down, but if you could send that updated fiscal note to the Committee so we have that in writing, it would be great.

Members, do you have any questions? [There were none.] Is there is anyone who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 389 (1st Reprint)?

Valerie Haskin, Coordinator, Rural Regional Behavioral Health:

A large part of my job is working with stakeholders from all aspects of the behavioral health system, both across the state as well as my specific region, which is the six northeastern rural and frontier counties. That being said, I have had the opportunity to speak with law enforcement leaders as well as social workers, nonprofit leaders, and many others, including hospitals. The discontinuation of care between release from detention into community settings, creates a large barrier, particularly in our rural communities where there may be long waits for care. Not having someone signed up for Medicaid or within services previous to release, really creates a lot of issues. I spoke to one undersheriff recently who said that in their jail, they had well over 100 inmates; the majority of which had substance abuse and mental illness issues and that of the \$1 million they spent in medical expenses last year, the

majority was related to that treatment. Looking at section 1, in the services that would be covered, this really lays the foundation for a lot of practices that would really help move people through that transition into care and create that continuity. Thank you very much. This seems like a great bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of A.B. 389 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 389 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in neutral on A.B. 389 (R1)?

Kirk Widmar:

I wanted to commit to the record that the waiver application is a very arduous process, and the Department of Corrections is committed to work very closely with our colleagues at the Department of Health and Human Services to provide the data and provide the resources needed to conduct a successful application process and an approval of the waiver.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 389 (R1) and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 502.

Assembly Bill 502: Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Department of Health and Human Services for an unanticipated revenue shortfall and an increase in operating costs. (BDR S-1104)

JoAnn Malay, MPH, RN, Deputy Administrator, Clinical Services and Mental Health, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:

Assembly Bill 502 is for a supplemental appropriation to the Division for an unanticipated revenue shortfall and an increase in operating costs. Section 1 of this bill states a sum of \$589,999 based on the Division projections done in January. However, evaluations completed subsequent to the January projections show a reduction in General Fund, and the total amount of the General Fund appropriation today is \$471,798; a reduction of \$118,201 in the General Fund appropriation.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Would you restate the revised amount, and will you be sending over an amendment for that revision?

JoAnn Malay:

The total amount now is \$471,798. We did provide this to the Legislative Counsel Bureau and the Governor's Finance Office, and we were guided to present this revision at the table.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

If you could just submit something in writing to my committee manager, so we can have it to take it to the work session.

Are there any questions on Assembly Bill 502 or the adjusted amount? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 502? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 502? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 502 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 504.

Assembly Bill 504: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Office of Economic Development in the Office of the Governor for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software and the costs of office furniture, communication services, certain staff certification and office modification. (BDR S-1140)

James M. Humm, Director, Public Policy and Government Affairs, Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on the merits of this bill. In an effort to conserve time, I will walk you through this relatively quickly. Section 1 is the replacement of office computer, hardware, and software. These are all within their replacement schedules. Section 2 is for the purchase of new office furniture for three staff members, for three new office spaces, in the Carson City location. Section 3 is for staff member professional development and certification from the International Economic Development Council. Section 4, subsection 1, is also for computer replacement, also within respective replacement schedules. Section 4, subsection 2, is for the Apex Accelerator computer replacement. Section 5, subsection 1, is for the Apex Accelerator for office modifications and section 5, subsection 2, is for the same matter. I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Do you anticipate any amendments to this piece of legislation?

James M. Humm:

My apologies, I should have stated that there are no amendments.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you. If you are able to get items at a discounted price, any money left over will be reverted back to the General Fund at the end of FY 2025. Correct?

James M. Humm:

That is correct. My incredible fiscal team is always looking for a great deal, so we will make that commitment.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, are there any questions on Assembly Bill 504? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 504? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to this bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the position of neutral? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 504 and we will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 510.

Assembly Bill 510: Makes appropriations to the Department of Motor Vehicles for the replacement or purchase of computer hardware and software, office furniture and equipment. (BDR S-1176)

**Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Research and Project Management Division,
Department of Motor Vehicles:**

Assembly Bill 510 makes appropriations from the State Highway Fund to various divisions of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) for replacement of computer hardware, software, printers, office furniture, and other end-of-life equipment.

Replacement of this equipment aligns with standard replacement schedules. We need to update some of the dollar amounts in the bill, due to updated vendor quotes and corrections to the quantities, which we provided to the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). In section 3, for the replacement of office furniture and replacement equipment in the DMV Transformation Effort budget, the \$200,181 needs to be amended to \$205,610. In section 4, for the replacement of computer hardware and software in the DMV Transformation Effort budget, the amount of \$15,456 needs to be amended to \$15,208. In section 12 for the replacement of computer hardware and software in the DMV's compliance enforcement budget, the \$167,546 needs to be amended to \$168,041. In section 15 for the replacement of office furniture and equipment in the DMV's research and project management budget, the \$28,369 needs to be amended to \$27,985. We appreciate your considering our requests and can answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you so much for that, and regarding the updated information I did not receive, that you said you sent to the LCB—if you could send that to our committee manager so that we have it for the file, that would be great.

Members, do you have any questions on this budget? [There were none.] I will remind members that any of the unspent Highway Funds on these items in this agenda item would revert back at the end of FY 2025. Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 510? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 510? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the position of neutral on A.B. 510? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 510 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 511.

Assembly Bill 511: Makes appropriations to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health of the Department of Health and Human Services for the replacement of computer hardware and associated software, the replacement of office furniture and equipment and deferred maintenance projects. (BDR S-1184)

JoAnn Malay, MPH, RN, Deputy Administrator, Clinical Services and Mental Health, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:

I am presenting Assembly Bill 511 which again makes appropriations, or one shots, to the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) for replacement of computer hardware, office furniture, equipment, and deferred maintenance projects. There are no revisions to these sections. Would you like me to state each section, or go directly to questions?

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I am going to share our notes with you. There was a revision based on the closing actions of the money committees regarding certain deferred maintenance that was funded in the Aging and Disability Services Division for the Sierra Regional Center budget and the Division of Child and Family Services and the Northern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services budget and for buildings transferred from DPBH to those divisions. Section 6 of this bill should be reduced to the amount of \$264,870. If you were not watching the hearing that day, you may not have been aware of that, so I wanted to share that with you.

John Borrowman, Chief Financial Officer, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:

I appreciate the clarification. In the original Governor's recommended budget, we did have a transfer once the appropriation was made to DPBH in the closing hearing. You are correct, the appropriation is no longer being funneled to DPBH to transfer and instead that appropriation is being made directly to the Aging and Disability Services Division. We concur with that. Thank you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will make those adjustments according to the closing for those budget items. Members, do you have any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Assembly Bill 511? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 511? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in neutral on A.B. 511? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 511 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 512.

Assembly Bill 512: Makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditure of money by the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services of the Department of Health and Human Services for certain information technology upgrades and projects. (BDR S-1185)

Lisa Swearingen, Deputy Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services:

I am going to present to you Assembly Bill 512, which makes appropriations to and authorizes the expenditures of money by the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services for certain information technology upgrades and projects. Currently, most of our computers and software will not be able to support, or be compatible with Windows 11, which goes live in October of 2025. It is a necessity for our agency to update our computers, hardware, and software. Section 1 of this bill is requesting \$551,505 in appropriations from the State General Fund. In addition, we are expecting to draw down \$1,355,426 in federal funds to support this effort. This request will replace computer equipment and associated software within budget account 3228. Section 2 of this bill is requesting \$281,644 in appropriations from the General Fund. In addition, we are expecting to drawdown \$688,879 in federal funds to support this effort. This request will enhance the Wi-Fi technology within all of our offices and procure licenses to improve effectiveness within the offices as well as our customers. Section 3 of the bill is requesting \$825,817 in appropriations from General Fund. In addition, we are expecting to draw down \$1,814,265 in federal funds to support this effort. This request will replace computer equipment and associated software within budget account 3233. Section 4 of this bill is requesting \$16,420,672 in appropriations from General Fund. In addition, we are expecting to draw down \$31,875,429 in federal funds to support this effort. This request will support the continuation of the Child Support Enforcement Program's technology modernization project. This concludes my presentation of A.B. 512, and I am happy to take any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

There will be no amendments coming for this bill, correct?

Lisa Swearingen:

That is correct.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions from Committee members on Assembly Bill 512? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of A.B. 512? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 512? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wants to testify in neutral on A.B. 512? [There was no one.]

I will open the meeting for public comment. [There was none.]

Meeting adjourned [at 9:22 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Anne Bowen
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a letter submitted by Lorraine Benuto, Clinical Psychologist, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Nevada, Reno, in support of [Assembly Bill 37](#).

[Exhibit D](#) is a letter submitted by Jorge A. Cao Noya, M.A., Graduate Student, University of Nevada, Reno, dated May 17, 2023, in support of [Assembly Bill 37](#).

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter submitted by Megan Comlossy, Associate Director, Center for Public Health Excellence, UNR School of Public Health; and Andrea L. Gregg, Chief Executive Officer, High Sierra AHEC, dated May 17, 2023, in support of [Assembly Bill 37](#).

[Exhibit F](#) is a letter submitted by Aviva Gordon, Chair, Legislative Committee, Henderson Chamber of Commerce; and Emily Osterberg, Director of Government Affairs, Henderson Chamber of Commerce, dated May 17, 2023, in support of [Assembly Bill 37](#).

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter submitted by Jamelle Nance, Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance, dated May 18, 2023, in support of [Assembly Bill 37](#).

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter submitted by Whitney E. Koch-Owens, Psy.D., President, State Board of Psychological Examiners, dated February 27, 2023, in support of [Assembly Bill 37](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is a letter submitted by Christine Saunders, MSW, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, dated May 18, 2023, in support of [Assembly Bill 125 \(1st Reprint\)](#).