101 NORTH CARSON STREET

CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701-3713

OFFICE: (775) 684-5670



1 STATE OF NEVADA WAY

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89119-4339

OFFICE: (702) 486-2500

Office of the Governor

June 2, 2025

The Honorable Nicole Cannizzaro
Majority Leader of the Nevada State Senate
401 South Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Re: Senate Bill 171 of the 83rd Legislative Session

Dear Leader Cannizzaro:

I am forwarding to you, for filing within the time limit set forth in the Nevada Constitution and without my approval, Senate Bill 171 ("SB 171"), which is titled as follows:

AN ACT relating to health care; prohibiting health care licensing boards from disqualifying from licensure or disciplining a person for providing or assisting in the provision of medically necessary gender-affirming health care services; prohibiting in certain circumstances the Governor from extraditing a person who is charged with a crime in another state related to medically necessary gender-affirming healthcare services; prohibiting state agencies from assisting in certain investigations and proceedings initiated in other states related to medically necessary gender-affirming health care services; requiring certain health care licensing boards to examine the feasibility of reciprocal licensure for health care providers who provide gender-affirming health care services in other states; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

SB 171 is well-intentioned but has a critical ambiguity that risks judicial invalidation and undermines the bill's intended protections. The use of the word "prudent" in Sections 1(2)(c), 2(4)(b), and 3(5)(b) is flawed in that it would require a subjective interpretation be made without sufficient objective criteria. Is prudence measured by adhering to the standard of care among specialists, local or national norms, or some other type of consideration? Moreover, Section 1(2)(a)(1) defines gender-affirming care based on what a *competent* medical professional finds appropriate. But in Section 2(c), in defining

"medically necessary," the standard shifts to what a *prudent* provider would provide—possibly a broader, more cautious standard. This introduces a potential conflict between a patient-specific clinical judgment and a generalized notion of prudence. This conflict could result in legal challenges, insurance denials, or disciplinary actions based on differing interpretations of what qualifies as "medically necessary."

Additionally, SB 171 would lead to complicated legal battles and uncertainty about what laws providers must follow. If enacted, a doctor could perform services in this state but still face prosecution elsewhere. It is unwise to create potentially illusory legal protections. SB 171 would also put healthcare licensing boards in the awkward position of navigating potentially conflicting mandates in federal and state law.

Because SB 171 contains ambiguous language that creates a potential for legal challenge, I cannot support it.

For these reasons, I veto this bill and return it to you without my signature or approval.

Respectfully submitted

JOE LOMBARDO

Governor of Nevada

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Stavros Anthony, President of the Senate (without enclosure)
The Honorable Steve Yeager, Speaker of the Assembly (without enclosure)
The Honorable Francisco Aguilar, Secretary of State (without enclosure)
Brendan Bucy, Secretary of the Senate (without enclosure)
Bonnie Borda Hoffecker, Chief Clerk of the Assembly (without enclosure)
Diane Thornton, Legislative Counsel Bureau, Director (without enclosure)
Asher Killian, Legislative Counsel Bureau, Legislative Counsel (without enclosure)