

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON REVENUE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**Eighty-second Session
April 13, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development was called to order by Chair Dina Neal at 1:36 p.m. on Thursday, April 13, 2023, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Dina Neal, Chair
Senator Fabian Doñate, Vice Chair
Senator Pat Spearman
Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert
Senator Carrie A. Buck

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Nakamoto, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Christian Thauer, Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Connie Summers, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

William Harty, City of North Las Vegas
Pamela Neal
Michael Richardson
Webster Davis
Sarah Adler, National Alliance on Mental Illness
Helen Foley, FirstMed Health and Wellness
Misty Grimmer, Silver Summit Health Plan
Mendy Elliott, Nevada Housing Coalition; Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority; Nevada Rural Housing Authority; Reno Housing Authority
Nicole Rourke, City of Henderson
Nic Ciccone, City of Reno
Kelly Crompton, City of Las Vegas

Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development
April 13, 2023
Page 2

Joanna Jacob, Clark County
Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County
Beth Schmidt, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Susan Proffitt, Nevada Republican Club

CHAIR NEAL:

We will discuss Windsor Park and the City of North Las Vegas budgets in the presentation ([Exhibit C](#)).

Looking at the City of North Las Vegas fiscal year (FY) 2015-2016 budget, [Exhibit C](#), you can see the Community Development Windsor Park budgets noted as Windsor Park-FNMA-CDBG, Windsor Park and Windsor Park-FNMA. Can you tell me what FNMA represents?

WILLIAM HARTY (City of North Las Vegas):

The acronym FNMA, also known as Fannie Mae, stands for Federal National Mortgage Association that provides affordable mortgage financing.

CHAIR NEAL:

For the line items related to Windsor Park, my understanding is the Windsor Park funds in the Community Development Budget for Funds 233, 280 and 285, [Exhibit C](#), are either part of the 1998 bond or part of the allocation from the original \$14 million from the federal government. Can you explain the purpose of those accounts?

MR. HARTY:

Funds 233 and 285, [Exhibit C](#), are special revenue funds dedicated for the voluntary relocation program for Windsor Park. These funds were first set up in the 1990s to assist residents with relocation costs and down payments to purchase other homes outside of Windsor Park. For FY 2022-2023, the City of North Las Vegas has budgeted \$817,000 in expenditures for these two funds should any residents voluntarily elect to participate in the relocation programs. So far this year, we have not expended any of these funds.

Most of the funds come from the federal government with a small contribution from State government, and the program was administered by the City. Since 1990, the City has received and administered approximately \$14.5 million in Windsor Park funds with over 90 percent of the funding coming from the federal government—Fannie Mae, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds

and federal special-purpose grants. Additionally, the State contributed about \$500,000 in the early 1990s. The funds currently have a balance of \$2.3 million remaining to be administered by the City for relocation.

CHAIR NEAL:

When you look at Fund 233 for Windsor Park-FNMA-CDBG on the FY 2015-2016 adopted budget handout, [Exhibit C](#), there is a beginning balance of \$811,132, expenses of \$467,000 and an ending balance of \$344,132. What were the actual expenses?

MR. HARTY:

The handouts were not provided to Las Vegas, and I am not able to read the presentation numbers on the screen. I have not studied the expenditures in FY 2015-2016. However, because they are in the special revenue funds, they must be dedicated to Windsor Park and follow the federal guidelines for those funds.

CHAIR NEAL:

Without the handouts, are you then only prepared to address the FY 2022-2023 budget?

MR. HARTY:

I will attempt to answer any questions you have.

CHAIR NEAL:

For the FY 2016-2017 adopted budget, [Exhibit C](#), when you look at Fund 233 for Windsor Park-FNMA-CDBG, there is a beginning balance of \$811,056, expenses of \$467,000 and an ending balance of \$344,056. These numbers look similar to the FY 2015-2016 budget except for the ending balances. What were the actual expenses in FY 2016-2017?

MR. HARTY:

What you are looking at is a budget book, [Exhibit C](#). The expenses you see are budgeted expenses, not necessarily actual expenses. For a roll forward from FY 2015-2016 to FY 2016-2017, you are not going to see the same beginning fund balance as you would expect unless all the funds were expended in the prior year. What I suspect happened is that not as much was expended as was budgeted.

CHAIR NEAL:

On the adopted budget for FY 2018-2019, [Exhibit C](#), there was \$2,588,213 in the Windsor Park-FNMA-CDGB, Windsor Park and Windsor Park-FNMA Funds. In the Community Development Detail by Fund in this budget, Windsor Park shows revenues of \$170,454, expenses of \$170,151 and an ending fund balance of \$303. Windsor Park FNMA shows a beginning balance of \$854,806, revenues of \$265,200 and expenses of \$1,120,006. Do you know what happened in FY 2018-2019 that was expended on the Windsor Park residents?

MR. HARTY:

I do not. I came here today prepared to talk about the FY 2022-2023 adopted budget. I will reiterate the expenses you are seeing in the expense column are budgeted expenses, not necessarily actual expenses.

CHAIR NEAL:

I apologize that the presentation is not available to you.

I want explanations on the ending fund balance in FY 2018-2019 showing \$170,000 in expenses and \$303 left in the ending fund balance column. There is no indication on how the money was spent. I understand it is showing up in the expenditure column as a prior year but when you look at the future years, the balances are different. The approximately \$1 million in the FY 2018-2019 budget does not show up in the FY 2019-2020 budget or following budgets. It actually drops to \$250,000. In FY 2020-2021, the beginning fund balance is \$595,000, the expenses were \$250,000 with an end fund balance of \$345,000.

I am going to take the budget information off the screen and get my assistant to immediately transfer this document to you so you can explain the expenses as they relate to the Windsor Park community. I need to understand what was expended because as you stated, legally the dollars were only supposed to be spent on the Windsor Park residents for relocation. With the budgets showing fluctuating balances year over year, it is not clear this money was expended on the community. I have been in the community performing a number of cleanups, and we have not seen any relocations or movement of homes or anyone coming in and out of the neighborhood other than the remaining 90 residents.

I will close the budget presentation; but because Windsor Park residents are in attendance, I am going to turn the gavel over to Vice Chair Doñate for the Windsor Park Bill Draft Request (BDR) S-794 presentation.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST S-794: Establishes a program for the relocation of persons residing in the Windsor Park neighborhood of the City of North Las Vegas. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 450](#).)

SENATOR DINA NEAL (Senatorial District No. 4):

The earlier Windsor Park presentation was an effort to identify the funds the federal government gave to this community in the 1990s to relocate residents because they had subsidence in their neighborhood. The groundwater was removed from the neighborhood; because homes were built on fault lines, it caused subsidence of the homes.

A remedy was proposed in the early 1990s with federal dollars that involved the City of North Las Vegas going forward with U.S. Senator Harry Reid to make sure the issue in the early 1990s was going to be remedied with some form of money. Former councilman Theron Goynes was able to get an award of \$14 million from the U.S. Congress. In addition, the State had engaged in giving about \$500,000 when Morse Arberry, Jr., was the Chair of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means.

Of the 236 original residents, 90 remain in the community because of the 45 homes built by using the \$14 million award funds. These residents felt the new homes were substandard and that was not what they envisioned for their lives to move from their existing homes, although falling apart, to new homes they felt were falling apart as well.

I have been working on this matter with the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), William S. Boyd School of Law, including at least four law students, Professor Frank Fritz and Professor Ngai Pindell, who is now a Dean at a law school in Canada, since 2019. Together with UNLV film students, we created a documentary I will share today to tell the story of what was happening in Windsor Park. The documentary won several awards, including a student Emmy Award, and effectively tells the story of why I am bringing this legislation 30 years later and why I am pushing for a remedy at the State level and from the City to assist the 90 families remaining in Windsor Park.

I thank the Committee for its indulgence with the documentary we just saw. We continue to work and meet with my constituents in Windsor Park about what they need and what they require of me. We lost some residents during the COVID-19 pandemic, including Pastor Miller, one of the residents who would reset the bricks in the other neighbor's homes that were falling down because of the subsidence. That is what continues to fuel my energy and my desire to continue to move for these residents. Anyone who has met me knows I am a passionate advocate for my district. I was a passionate advocate when I was in the Assembly, and I remained a passionate advocate when I started to cover Assembly Districts 6 and 7 as the Senate District 4 leader. I care deeply for the plight of the folks in my district.

Annie Walker, who you saw in the film, is 86 years old and an original resident with her husband, Prentice Walker. They had the vision for the Windsor Park community. They were not aware that a geotechnical study should have been completed on the land which would have revealed the homes were being built on fault lines.

We started to remove groundwater before we had the Southern Nevada Water Authority, and that is what caused the subsidence of the homes. We have minute reports from the Legislature, congressional hearings and the City Council when Theron Goynes and William Robinson were trying to push for change until about 1999. After that time, the last 90 residents stayed; and that is the condition they live in today.

The bill presentation, a bill draft request, is proposing the State get involved. In 1992, the State provided \$500,000 to resolve this issue. In this bill, I am proposing an appropriation of \$10 million and asking that the remainder of the funds come from the City of North Las Vegas. The BDR notes how we intend to accomplish this, which is to work through the State Housing Division to move this issue and try to bring a remedy for these families.

The plan was to move the remaining residents together because as you have noticed, they are still a community, they still call each other on the phone, they still make sure everyone is okay and the potential of separating them and having them scattered throughout the City, which is what happened in the early 1990s, is not the goal and not the intent. The goal is to ensure the Windsor Park community will remain neighbors and they are eligible to be moved together.

I realize this is a big request, but the residents deserve it after 30 years. I decided I was going to bring the bill this Session. I needed to wait until we went through the exercises of trying to find developers, work with the community and reach a solution. The remaining residents cannot continue to live in this condition where sewage, and possibly lead poisoning and asbestos, is a problem. The legacy of the American Dream of owning a home got taken from the residents.

We discovered that some homes in the community were sold to unsuspecting Latino families. The latest home sold for \$350,000 in 2019. I met with a Latino woman who purchased her home in 2017. She told me her home insurance company would not cover the costs of repairs to her home. I saw in the 1989 legislative minutes that this was documented because there was an individual dedicated to helping Windsor Park residents relocate who stated that home insurance policies were arbitrarily canceled in 1989.

I grew up knowing the story. I had not yet graduated from high school, and I knew my dad was fighting for Windsor Park residents. When I got elected in 2011, not knowing I was going to be the first African-American female to come into this building, Windsor Park was on my list. I collected data and documentation for years, some of which Professor Pindell mentioned in the documentary, until the time was right to take on Goliath, but I cannot do so myself.

I brought all that documentation to them and said, if you can just help me because as strong as I am, I do not have the power to lift these 90 families by myself and I need you because I am tired of the excuses. I am tired of trying to tell the story to a group of people who have forgotten these people, who do not care that they are living in this condition and who are waiting for them to die out. If the last thing I ever do in this legislative building is something for them, that is what I am going to do. That was the promise that I made to them. I said, listen, whatever it takes, this elected leader will never leave you.

Whatever courage it takes to get into this building and ask for money, ask for \$20 million from the City that you live in, well I am going to have enough courage to ask for it. I am not leaving this building without a remedy for those families, and whatever happens in the space of that fight, I take it on squarely on my shoulders the way I have taken on everything else in my district for my people who I serve.

Because this is a BDR presentation, I am going to allow the residents to have their say. I want the Committee to hear their story. They will discuss the condition of their homes and how they feel about the BDR. They will speak to the justice they are seeking.

PAMELA NEAL:

We want our houses fixed. We want to be accommodated with the right amount of money my father put in his home when he bought it in 1972. We do not want the runaround. The City of North Las Vegas owns empty lots in the community. They do not even clean the lots. There are homeless people moving trailers on the land that is deserted, and the City is not doing its job to prevent this. We are paying taxes, but the City does not repair the streets or street signs. Where is the money that was allocated for us?

VICE CHAIR DOÑATE:

Please keep your comments directed to the Committee and not the audience.

Ms. NEAL:

I have spoken to you. If you can come out of those chairs and visit our neighborhood, you will realize we do not deserve the way the City is treating us. My father bought his home when I was two years old. I am now 53 years old and living in that home. I raised my children in the home and am raising my grandchildren there. There is still no remedy. Temperatures reach 115 degrees in Las Vegas in the summertime. There is no cover at the park to protect our children. We have asked over and over again, yet nothing is done for us. We have been patient. Since I am not allowed to speak with Mr. Harty today, can you as our Legislators get answers from him as to expenses and what happened to the money? The City of North Las Vegas has done nothing to the streets, to the empty lots or anything else to improve our neighborhood. But if we have any trash in our yard or an old car, they send code enforcement to issue tickets. I want to give the City of North Las Vegas a ticket for all their empty lots they are not maintaining. Since you are representing us, ask him why they are not doing that? Can we fine the City?

VICE CHAIR DOÑATE:

Are there any other copresenters who would like to address the Committee?

MICHAEL RICHARDSON:

I have been in Windsor Park since 1968 when my mom and dad bought their house. In my opinion, the City of North Las Vegas has been giving us the runaround forever. When it was first realized there was a problem in Windsor Park, an attorney was hired who said, "This is easy; this is the City of North Las Vegas's fault." But he wanted a retainer to get started, and we could never raise the funds. The City of North Las Vegas issued the permits to build the houses, so it is responsible.

When we asked ten years ago where the money was, they told us some of the money was not traceable. What does that mean? The money was supposed to be used for Windsor Park, but you are telling me you do not know where the money is, and it is not traceable. That is crazy to me. I feel like they will never fix the houses, especially with the number we have now. When there were more than 200 residents, they might have, but with only 90 residents, they just give us the runaround.

A possible solution is relocation with equal property value and acreage. Our home is what my mom and dad left us. It is our future, and that is what we wanted to pass down to the next generation. When they relocate us, we do not want any stipulations like the City of North Las Vegas would get the first \$50,000 or we cannot rent the house out or if we get any money, we need to spend it in North Las Vegas. We would like to get relocated to a place that is not sinking where we could stay together because we have been together for 50 years. Otherwise, we would have been gone a long time ago.

WEBSTER DAVIS:

I have been in Windsor Park since 1971. I have seen people come and go. My father bought the house in the early sixties. I moved there to help him. He passed in 1981. I paid the house off, tried to keep it up, and yet the City of North Las Vegas can only find ways to condemn us, not help us. If you are not careful, you will fall on the sidewalks that need repair. The streets have more dips and bumps than any neighborhood could stand. They removed houses but left the land uncared for. If you will come from Carson City and walk the streets of Windsor Park, you would shake your head because it is not a fit neighborhood with weeds growing everywhere and leaning houses.

The City of North Las Vegas makes promises that are not kept. Right is just right. If you are going to represent us, stand up for us, fight with us and for us.

Why should we have to suffer for the mistakes of others? When we first tried to form a group lawsuit, we were told they did not know which contractor we needed to sue because three or four contractors built the houses. Start with the City of North Las Vegas and sue the City that gave the contractors permission to build on defective land. Our kids cannot spend time outdoors because they have nowhere to play. We deserve rights. If the houses were not sinking, we would have no complaints. The neighborhood is ours, and we deserve so much better.

SENATOR NEAL:

This bill is going to get introduced on the Senate Floor on Monday. Then there will be a formal presentation; but because it is in a BDR format, I cannot take the normal support and opposition testimony for the bill. I can take the presentation from the residents that came to the table. Thank you for coming and thank you for your comments on the record. I will email the BDR to you, and then we will continue to have the formal bill hearing. I would ask the Windsor Park residents there to support the legislation to please stand so we can acknowledge you.

VICE CHAIR DOÑATE:

That concludes the presentation. I will turn the gavel back to Chair Neal.

CHAIR NEAL:

We will move forward with the work sessions without S.B. 125, which will not be heard today.

SENATE BILL 125: Revises provisions relating to transportation. (BDR 58-574)

CHRISTIAN THAUER (Deputy Fiscal Analyst):

I will summarize the provisions of S.B. 233 in the work session document (Exhibit D).

SENATE BILL 233: Revises provisions governing taxes imposed on certain heavy equipment. (BDR 32-87)

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

I thought a conceptual amendment was presented.

CHAIR NEAL:

Because the amendment is still a work in progress with the assessors, I did not want to present an amendment on which there is no agreement. The plan is to allow this bill to continue to move to the Finance Committee since it contains a tax.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

Given that, I will support getting the bill out of Committee but will not initially support the bill because we do not know where it is going to land. I understand industry is supporting it, but we do not know what the consequences are and how it affects the counties.

SENATOR BUCK:

I ditto Senator Seevers Gansert's comments.

CHAIR NEAL:

I will entertain a motion to re-refer S.B. 233 to the Senate Finance Committee without recommendation.

SENATOR DOÑATE MOVED TO RE-REFER WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION S.B. 233 TO THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. THAUER:

I will summarize the provisions of S.B. 240 and Senator Neal's conceptual amendment in the work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).

SENATE BILL 240: Revises provisions relating to the Nevada New Markets Jobs Act. (BDR 18-792)

CHAIR NEAL:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 240.

SENATOR SPEARMAN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 240.

SENATOR DOÑATE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. THAUER:

I will summarize the information on S.B. 278 and the amendments in the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).

SENATE BILL 278: Revises provisions governing child care. (BDR 32-290)

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

I want to thank both parties for pulling everything together for this bill.

CHAIR NEAL:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 278.

SENATOR SPEARMAN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 278.

SENATOR DOÑATE SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR BUCK:

I will vote yes but reserve my right on the Floor. I see this as an early childhood opportunity scholarship and support our most at-risk students to have child care or schooling.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. THAUER:

I will summarize the provisions of S.B. 428 in the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).

Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development
April 13, 2023
Page 13

SENATE BILL 428: Proposes to exempt sales of diapers from sales and use taxes and analogous taxes upon approval by the voters. (BDR 32-1033)

CHAIR NEAL:

I will entertain a motion to do pass S.B. 428.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 428.

SENATOR BUCK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. THAUER:

I will summarize S.B. 429 and its amendment in the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)).

SENATE BILL 429: Revises provisions governing economic development. (BDR 32-680)

CHAIR NEAL:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 429.

SENATOR DOÑATE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 429.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

I am going to support the bill out of Committee but reserve my right to vote no on the Floor. I like the idea of extending family medical leave to individuals, and there was a strong case made around working women.

SENATOR BUCK:

I ditto Senator Seevers Gansert's comments.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. THAUER:

I will summarize S.B. 430 and the Proposed Amendment 3596 in the work session document ([Exhibit I](#)).

SENATE BILL 430: Revises provisions relating to partial refunds of property taxes to certain persons who are 55 years of age or older. (BDR 38-999)

CHAIR NEAL:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 430.

SENATOR DOÑATE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 430.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. THAUER:

I will summarize details of S.B. 444, the Proposed Amendment 3567 and amendments to the Proposed Amendment 3567 in the work session document ([Exhibit J](#)). The bill was declared exempt on March 20, 2023.

SENATE BILL 444: Revises provisions relating to the excise tax on live entertainment. (BDR 32-602)

CHAIR NEAL:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 444 with the restoration of the live entertainment exemption.

SENATOR DOÑATE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 444.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development
April 13, 2023
Page 15

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

I will be opposing the legislation. It is still an extension of the taxes.

SENATOR BUCK:

I ditto Senator Seevers Gansert's comments.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS BUCK AND SEEVERS GANSERT
VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR NEAL:

I will close the work session and turn the gavel over to Vice Chair Doñate for the hearing on S.B. 400.

SENATE BILL 400: Revises provisions governing taxation related to the funding of metropolitan police departments and programs to address homelessness. (BDR 38-1027)

SENATOR DINA NEAL (Senatorial District No. 4):

A conceptual amendment ([Exhibit K](#)) has been introduced on S.B. 400. I wanted to have a conversation this Session about how to fund homelessness services in Nevada. The conceptual amendment presents ideas to balance the needs between northern and southern Nevada around homelessness services and try to establish a funding source for local governments that is, ideally, in perpetuity and then layer additional local government funding on top.

We have had serious issues in Nevada regarding folks who no longer have homes or are displaced. In southern Nevada, the homeless are overflowing onto The Strip. We have homeless sitting on the sidewalks with expansion into neighborhoods and communities. We need to work on how to fund programs that make sense so homelessness can be reduced.

Paragraph 1 of the third version of the proposed conceptual amendment, [Exhibit K](#), for S.B. 400 creates a fiscal workgroup. We have the federally funded Continuum of Care (COC) program in Nevada that has a fiscal committee or workgroup. I did not want to create another standing agency or group that would have jurisdiction over the fund but instead wanted to create a fiscal workgroup within the three Nevada COCs to include the

Northern Nevada COC, the Southern Nevada Homelessness COC and the Rural Nevada COC to oversee the funds. The fiscal workgroup would include a member from gaming, the police department, the county and the city. The majority of the cities in rural and southern Nevada are already a part of the COC. This fiscal workgroup would not include a member of the Legislature. Without allowing for proportionality, each entity within the fiscal workgroup would have an equal vote to decide how to fund homelessness programs outside of what the federal government has already established.

Most COCs get federal dollars, and they have already been designated for some particular group. Senate Bill 400 would offer money that operates outside of the COC programs but within the structure of the fiscal workgroup to reduce the bureaucracy already existing around homelessness groups or interagency councils.

The funding in S.B. 400 will not supplant existing federal funds already established by federal funding or grants. The plan is to allow the fiscal workgroup to fund and develop flexible solutions around three entry points.

One entry point is developing a COC of services around the exit from jail that includes sustainable interventions for medication, prescription services, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, emergency housing and supportive housing. The second entry point is to develop a COC upon exit from an emergency shelter, such as the Las Vegas Corridor of Hope or the Nevada Cares Campus in Washoe County for sustainable medication, prescription services, alcohol and drug interventions, emergency housing and supportive housing.

It is recommended that \$9 million from the flexible funding go to the City of Las Vegas to help fully build out the Las Vegas Corridor of Hope. It is my understanding the City of Las Vegas has general fund dollars going to the Corridor, but it still needs to be fully built out to accomplish what it was established to do. This money would be treated as additional funding on top of the base funding the City has in the general fund.

I talked to the sheriff, folks in a State interagency group and in Clark County, and there was a lot of conversation about shared resources and how we move homelessness between borders. On the North Las Vegas side, the homeless are pushed to the Las Vegas side. When they come from the Las Vegas side, they are pushed to the North Las Vegas side. There was a conversation about how

Henderson, even though it may not have the same level of problems as the City of Las Vegas, has a border issue where it connects between the Las Vegas and County border that picks up Henderson.

Although the bill will probably come with some objection, folks wanted to make sure I included North Las Vegas and Henderson in sharing some of the dollars associated with reducing homelessness or at least participating as an entity. This bill is a work in progress, but I wanted to move it to encompass the conversations I was having, mostly with the sheriff.

The third entry point is when we work with the Street Team. The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) police has Hot Teams, Care Teams or Street Teams that interface with homeless populations. In paragraph 2, subparagraph c, the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit K](#), states the LVMPD must continue to fund, through its existing dollars, the Hot Team for the outreach and coordination with other Care Teams or Street Teams. The City of Las Vegas and the County have either a Care Team or Street Team that is dispatched to meet the homeless population or interface with individuals to determine what services are required.

The plan for funding was to use a General Fund carveout in the amount of \$.225 from the 6.75 percent rate that happens to represent our Resort Corridor which is \$30 million. It is not a tax increase. The revenue would be used for the homeless populations who are exiting in acute care settings, emergency rooms, psychiatric hospitals, detox facilities, safe havens and transitional housing and they need sustainable prescription services, medication, alcohol and drug intervention and supportive housing.

We know the homeless exist, but we cannot keep them stable. We need to determine how we are going to accomplish wraparound care to sustain the population while we either get them off substance abuse, mentally stable and in medication systems.

We know there is a lot of work going on. The question is where to get the additional funding so it all makes sense. If there is not enough money to build the continuum outside of federal dollars, we will continue to spin our wheels. I wanted to insert myself and this bill into the conversation because we need a funding source that will help the local governments fill the gap and build the pathway upon those exits to make sure the homeless are stable. If you cannot

stabilize them and only give them medication within the 30 days after they leave jail, the hospital or a shelter, they will be back on the street. We need to fund a plan to keep the medication going until they have emergency or supportive housing.

The effort to resolve this problem would include county and local funds and the additional \$30 million to spread among various projects such as supportive housing and the sustainability of rehabilitation programs. The idea is to provide some general framework and then determine how to apply money to the Statewide COCs so they can have conversations around these particular suggestions.

Paragraph 3 of the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit K](#), talks about the reinvestment advisory committee formed as a result of S.B. No. 309 of the 81st Session. This bill came after a bill in the Eightieth Session that was for a sewage tax for homelessness services. At that time, I was in the Assembly, and I amended the bill so both bills would work together over the next year or so to allow the cities and nonprofits to meet and determine what was needed to solve homelessness.

Senate Bill No. 309 of the 81st Session was brought back to focus on how to utilize the reinvestment dollars the managed care organizations (MCOs) have for homelessness services. I met with two of the four MCOs, and everyone is doing something different. One agency was focusing on affordable housing, another agency, Silver Summit, was focusing on other issues with its reinvestment dollars.

What I had in mind when I signed my name to S.B. No. 309 of the 81st Session was that funds would go to homelessness services to reduce homelessness. I continued to hear that funds were being used for affordable housing when what we needed was permanent supportive housing. We need to build into emergency housing for the homeless after we take them off the street.

Senate Bill 400 will continue to be massaged because there are different viewpoints, but the idea was to use that funding source in addition to the \$30 million. When the bill came out, it was about \$9 million a year. It is more than that now based on what people have told me they are spending for services. The plan is to take the \$30 million, the \$.225 carveout, add the MCO reinvestment dollars and then establish broader funding that would work toward

the end goal which is another funding source directed toward homelessness solutions.

Paragraph 4 of the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit K](#), indicates that a portion of the General Fund with that carveout rate of 22.5 cents must be used to fund State stabilizing interventions around emergency and supportive housing and rehabilitation of buildings for supportive housing. The money would be combined with other dollars from the local governments.

Local governments are already spending money. If we got the extra \$30 million and reimagined the MCO dollars that are reinvested for the next contract period to pull that all together to do something different, what then would the ask be?

Skipping to paragraph 6, [Exhibit K](#), federally qualified healthcare centers (FQHCs) will become part of this model. I met with groups in northern Nevada doing a good job of creating a model that has FQHC shelters and local governments working together. I thought FQHCs should be a part of this conversation in southern Nevada because they have a higher rate of Medicaid reimbursement than regular Medicaid. People asked what providers would do the work. If you have a higher reimbursement rate for Medicaid, you have a higher chance of getting that provider to help build the team and the model because now you have a partnership with an FQHC that has a higher reimbursement rate to offer a pathway to providers.

To summarize, the questions are how do we get more money, what role does the State play and how do we offset what is going on with homelessness which is getting out of hand? We need to do something to change the narrative and funding around homelessness in Nevada.

VICE CHAIR DOÑATE:

After tours of facilities that do crisis intervention or provide some level of care, have you had conversations as to facility type and reimbursement? The request I have had is because of the facility type and requirements, the facilities are not able to get reimbursement or change some of their beds. Would this fall under the purview of [S.B. 400](#)?

SENATOR NEAL:

I have not had that conversation. I continue to share iterations of this bill with the entities from which I am seeking funds.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

The Department of Health and Human Services has a program that when people exit incarceration, they are set up in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Medicaid and other services needed to survive. Are any of these groups integrating that option, and is there any follow-up with the individuals to ensure their needs are being met?

SENATOR NEAL:

The gap is the actual sustainability upon these exit points and how to sustain them for 30, 60 or 90 days. My initial goal is to develop a framework, then apply money to it. This bill is still in need of more amendments or massaging of the terms. This version of the amendment has information from Brooke Page, but I still need to determine if this will meet the need giving power to one entity over another.

SENATOR BUCK:

I have worked with Novum-U. To get released from prison, an individual must have somewhere to go or a sponsor if he or she has no family. Novum-U provides wraparound services as does Vegas Stronger. Many of the homeless with mental health or addiction issues need more than just housing. How do these organizations or nonprofits get access to these dollars?

SENATOR NEAL:

That would be something the members of the fiscal workgroup would have to consider. I am not prescribing all of that. The intent was to give some general framework of what the overall needs would be and then let them work out how they would address the needs and what the application process would be. One of the things missing is making sure that some of the smaller nonprofits could participate. In all my conversations, I heard there were small nonprofits who do things well but do not get a chance to be a part of the model or a larger team. It is my intent to add language to allow the smaller nonprofits to do the work because they have been excluded.

SENATOR BUCK:

I was able to tour Vegas Stronger. When jurisdictions call team members, they take people off the street, get them the therapy they need, and they earn shelter because they want it. My husband is in law enforcement, and many times when he speaks to the homeless, they do not want to go to a house or shelter. Getting them the support they need with addiction and mental illness

and not putting those steps in place before giving them a house is an important consideration.

SENATOR NEAL:

The conceptual amendment, [Exhibit K](#), is still a work in progress. I did not want to lose this bill draft request or the bill. I wanted to continue to work on it, get it out of this Committee and then continue to work with stakeholders to refine the bill to where I know all the funding sources will be in play and how they will be used.

I have spent the majority of my time working on what the carveout was and trying to get folks to agree to that. I think it is a concept we need to keep refining to get an end product that will reduce homelessness, with the State putting in 22.5 cents from the 6.75 percent rate, and then giving some thought to the reinvestment dollars going toward the homelessness services and grandfathering in some of the MCOs already doing good work. I do not feel MCOs should be doing affordable housing. My expectation with S.B. No. 309 of the 81st Session was that it went to homeless services.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

A number of smaller 501(c)(3) organizations do not get notoriety. That became apparent during the COVID-19 pandemic when a number of communities needed services and had community health workers who were already doing the service, but they were not getting any money. Some of the services you have elucidated in this bill are being done by community people. My suggestion is that the fiscal workgroup reach out to communities and community organizations because many times the people in the community already know what is needed.

SENATOR NEAL:

The fiscal workgroup continues to be massaged. The purpose of [S.B. 400](#) is to put money into the homelessness problem and figure out how at least \$30 million could work to try to fill some of the gap within the need to serve these populations. It is not a lot of money but a step in the right direction to maximize the \$30 million and reimagine reinvestment dollars to do an overlay.

VICE CHAIR DOÑATE:

We will open the hearing for testimony in support of [S.B. 400](#).

SARAH ADLER (National Alliance on Mental Illness):

I have been before the Committee recommending the need to identify a revenue stream for supportive housing. The National Alliance on Mental Illness is excited about this proposal. Many of the homeless are persons suffering from mental illness, addiction and co-occurring disorders. Our hope is to speak with the sponsor to address the opportunity for supportive housing and support people who are not homeless but have chronic disabling conditions. We are in support of S.B. 400.

HELEN FOLEY (FirstMed Health and Wellness):

FirstMed is a federally qualified health center in southern Nevada. All FOHCs provide primary care and must have a secondary care, most often dental care. Since FirstMed relaunched in 2008, we decided our secondary focus was going to be mental health. Last year, we had 30,000 mental health encounters and 1,500 medication-assisted treatment programs (MAT) for those with different types of disorders with substance abuse. Homelessness is an ugly issue affecting businesses and other entities around the homeless, and it continues to get worse. Housing is an important part of homelessness. Once they have been taken care of in the Corridor of Hope and then they are let go, where do they go? What do they do?

We provide a lot of wraparound services at FirstMed and have a higher reimbursement rate from Medicaid. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) awarded us a grant of \$1.8 million over three years which we will start receiving in July. For the first time, HUD has funded a homeless project prioritizing health care as a chronic condition of homelessness. We will house up to 50 individuals who have chronic mental health or physical issues, including the need for MAT. We work cooperatively with the COC and have received grants from the City of Las Vegas, but there is much more to do. There are wonderful organizations already doing work to assist the homeless. They could utilize some of this money, and we can all work together. FirstMed pledges to work hand-in-hand with Senator Neal on S.B. 400.

MISTY GRIMMER (Silver Summit Health Plan):

We met with Senator Neal and talked through the ways we have invested community investment dollars. The changes to the bill still allow for flexibility and conversation about how those dollars are spent.

We designed our program to be more of a grant program. To Senator Spearman's point, we do give opportunity to and have funded some of the smaller organizations which in other circumstances would not get funding. We look forward to continuing to work with Senator Neal on S.B. 400.

MENDY ELLIOTT (Nevada Housing Coalition; Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority; Nevada Rural Housing Authority; Reno Housing Authority):
As we work through this holistic approach to the 0 percent to 30 percent Area Median Income (AMI), the housing authorities and the expertise they can provide will bring more context to the bill.

The State is changing as it relates to wraparound services and placing an emphasis on services individuals need to keep people housed and, more importantly, to help them to improve their futures. We recognize some folks will stay at 0 percent or 30 percent AMI and in that type of housing, but we are also here to provide training and other services. Nonprofits continue to provide services to these individuals to help them grow. We look forward to continuing to work with Senator Neal and are excited about this bill.

NICOLE ROURKE (City of Henderson):

We just got the amendment this afternoon and have not had an opportunity to have much of a conversation. We are not sure how the allocation amount came about. We have more questions than answers at this point so we look forward to having conversations with the sponsor as she moves this bill forward.

NIC CICCONE (City of Reno):

While supportive housing services and affordable housing is important to us, we share the same concerns as the City of Henderson. We did not have much time to review the amendment, and I am not sure what it would look like for us given we do not have a metropolitan police department. We would like to continue working with the sponsor of the bill.

KELLY CROMPTON (City of Las Vegas):

We are in the same boat. We just got the amendment. There were many changes to the funding and how that might work. We are still looking at this bill and hope to work with the sponsor.

I would like to address the dollars the City of Las Vegas contributes and some of the approaches we have made since part of the Corridor of Hope sits in the

downtown area of the City of Las Vegas. Years ago, we took a regional approach with elected members from different bodies of local government and small and large nonprofits as we looked at approaches that might help bring nonprofits and different wraparound services to the individuals experiencing homelessness. The Courtyard that sits in the City of Las Vegas was meant to be a regional takeback from tourists so a lot of those dollars are going into services like the Recuperative Care Center to ensure those people have a place to stay when there may be regional barriers or barriers of entry at some of the other nonprofits.

We support S.B. 400 and thank the bill sponsor for looking for a dedicated revenue service for this effort. We see many individuals experiencing homelessness in our jurisdiction, so we have been working with her for years to try to find a solution. We look forward to continued conversations to help find a regional approach to homelessness.

JOANNA JACOB (Clark County):

We only saw this amendment before the meeting, but we appreciate the shared approach on this because Clark County has put significant federal dollars into a stair-step model trying to fund all the points of intervention needed to move people toward a sustainable housing placement. We have invested in capacity building and have tried to do some smaller dollar investing to build up small nonprofits because it helps us to deliver services.

We worked with Senator Neal on S.B. No. 309 of the 81st Session. One of the recommendations that Clark County put in the Medicaid Reinvestment Advisory Committee was for permanent supportive housing. I agree with Senator Neal on the original intent of that bill. One of the things we want to work on is the structure of the fiscal committee. I agree we need to reduce the bureaucratic barriers for the consumers of care. We might have to look at the committee structure more closely because it is a HUD-prescribed committee, and we want to avoid more barriers. We are going to work with the Senator on this bill and hope to move forward in the process with something more solidified.

CADENCE MATIJEVICH (Washoe County):

I do not want to belabor the points heard from other local governments. We appreciate any effort to bring more dollars to the table to address the homeless situations in our communities.

In Washoe County, the City of Reno, the City of Sparks and the County entered into an interlocal agreement on August 30, 2021, on how services would be provided to the homeless in our communities. We built the Cares Campus, and we are starting to see fantastic results. As a follow-up to a County Commission meeting earlier this week, it was reported that in the second half of 2022, 74 percent who left the Cares Campus were still housed six months later. We are seeing improvements.

We appreciate the desire to have a shared approach to providing these services to our shared constituents. We too have questions about the makeup of the fiscal committee. Is it a separate fiscal committee for each continuum of care? Is it a single fiscal committee? We heard a lot of discussion around money that would be allocated within Clark County, but we do not understand how this translates to the other parts of the State. We look forward to being a part of ongoing conversations and, like our other local government partners, working to come to a position of support.

BETH SCHMIDT (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department is committed to working in partnership with Clark County, the City of Las Vegas and all stakeholders in Clark County to address homelessness, addiction and mental health. Sheriff Kevin McMayhill has been clear not only when he was running for office but also when he became sheriff that these are crises, and we need to come together to address them. All the Clark County stakeholders are coming together and believe that together we can effect change in Clark County and bring much-needed help to our most vulnerable citizens. We are in neutral now but will continue to work with Senator Neal on S.B. 400.

SUSAN PROFFITT (Nevada Republican Club):

I would like to ditto Ms. Schmidt's comments. We do need to take care of our homeless and certainly need to take care of our police, but I do not see what the two have to do with each other. I do not think funding our police needs should be run through health and human services with the involvement of Medicaid. I have noticed a lot of bills running money through Medicaid this year, and I do not understand why. I would like some clarification on this and who is overseeing the Medicare people who are managing our money. Thank you for bringing S.B. 400, and I hope you can improve it.

SENATOR NEAL:

The amendment before us today is an imperfect amendment. The LVMPD language is in the amendment because originally the bill had a property tax override that was set to expire in 2027. I was going to remove the sunset early and take 3 cents. In addition, there was another funding source attached to the LVMPD language.

I am asking this Committee to allow me to move S.B. 400, continue to work to refine the language, get all the stakeholders in the room and work out a structure that will make sense because I want to do a funding source in this Session on homelessness. We know the bill will go to the Senate Finance Committee because it has a carveout of an existing revenue stream that is a tax.

VICE CHAIR DOÑATE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 400, and I will turn the gavel back to Chair Neal.

CHAIR NEAL:

I will accept a motion to amend and re-refer S.B. 400 without recommendation to the Finance Committee.

SENATOR DOÑATE MOVED TO AMEND AND RE-REFER WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION S.B. 400 TO THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION

SENATOR BUCK:

I am going to vote yes on the bill reserving my right for the Floor. I hope everybody can come together for a solution. However, I do not want to vote on an additional tax.

CHAIR NEAL:

To be clear, funding will be a General Fund carveout from a particular source I cannot mention until I get the final nod.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

I am going to support S.B. 400.

Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development
April 13, 2023
Page 27

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

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

Senate Committee on Revenue and Economic Development
April 13, 2023
Page 28

CHAIR NEAL:
The meeting is adjourned at 3:42 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Connie Summers,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Dina Neal, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Introduced on Minute Report Page No.	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
	C	2	Senator Dina Neal	Windsor Park BDR S-794 Presentation
S.B. 233	D	10	Christian Thauer	Work Session Document
S.B. 240	E	11	Christian Thauer	Work Session Document
S.B. 278	F	12	Christian Thauer	Work Session Document
S.B. 428	G	12	Christian Thauer	Work Session Document
S.B. 429	H	13	Christian Thauer	Work Session Document
S.B. 430	I	14	Christian Thauer	Work Session Document
S.B. 444	J	14	Christian Thauer	Work Session Document
S.B. 400	K	15	Senator Dina Neal	Conceptual Amendment