

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Eighty-first Session
May 5, 2021**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Chris Brooks at 6:32 p.m. on Wednesday, May 5, 2021, Online and in Room 1214 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Chris Brooks, Chair
Senator Moises Denis, Vice Chair
Senator Julia Ratti
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop
Senator Ben Kieckhefer
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Roberta Lange, Senatorial District No. 7

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Wayne Thorley, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Tom Weber, Committee Secretary
Melodie Swanson, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mark Wlaschin, Deputy Secretary of State for Elections, Elections Division,
Office of the Secretary of State
Gennady Stolyarov, Chief Executive, Nevada Transhumanist Party; Chairman,
U.S. Transhumanist Party
Janine Hansen, Independent American Party of Nevada

Senate Committee on Finance
May 5, 2021
Page 2

Kimberly Fergus
Richard Clark
Richard Winger, Coalition for Free and Open Elections
Bob Russo
Dan Twedt
Susan Brown, Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor
Matthew Tuma, Deputy Director, Department of Administration
Alan Cunningham, State Chief Information Officer, Division of Enterprise
Information Technology Services, Department of Administration
Mandi Davis, Deputy Administrator, Administrator Services, Division of Child
and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services
Martin Mleczko, Captain, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety
Sherri Brueggemann, Deputy Director, Department of Public Safety
Jessica Hoban, Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Attorney General

CHAIR BROOKS:

We will hear bills. We begin with Senate Bill (S.B.) 292.

SENATE BILL 292 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to elections.
(BDR 24-999)

WAYNE THORLEY (Senate Fiscal Analyst):

The Office of the Secretary of State submitted a fiscal note on S.B. 292, as introduced, indicating S.B. 292 would require the Secretary of State's Office to conduct a voter education campaign to inform voters about the choice to use straight-ticket voting (STV). The Office estimates the voter education campaign would cost \$660,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2022-2023 based on previous experience with voter education campaigns.

Fiscal staff notes various local governments submitted fiscal notes on S.B. 292, as introduced, indicating S.B. 292 would have a fiscal impact on their respective counties.

CHAIR BROOKS:

Senator Lange is the sponsor of S.B. 292. Senator Lange will present S.B. 292 specifically concentrating on the voter education piece which created the fiscal note.

SENATOR ROBERTA LANGE (Senatorial District No. 7):

Sections 1, 4 and 5 of S.B. 292 relate to providing a STV option. Sections 1 and 5 provide that all ballots in any form must permit a voter to vote for all the candidates of one political party on the ballot in partisan races. This would be done by marking the name of the political party at the top of the ballot.

Section 4 of S.B. 292 requires existing voter education programs provided by the county election offices to incorporate information into their programs as to how to cast a STV if a voter so chooses.

The STV option provides voters with the choice to vote a straight party ticket or, alternatively, to vote a straight party ticket and then subsequently choose to vote for another party in a specific race which would take precedence over the STV. There is no mandate.

Section 2 of S.B. 292 specifically reverts the requirements for signatures. Sections 2 and 3 of S.B. 292 update the Nevada laws relating to third party ballot access.

Section 6 of S.B. 292 requires the Governor to fill any Senate vacancies by nominating a person of the same political party as the appointee. The next components describe how vacancies would be filled for representatives in Congress. The following component specifies how a position would be appointed should a vacancy occur in the Nevada Legislature. In the later, the Legislature would give its recommendations to the county commissioners as to who should fill a vacant position.

Section 15 of S.B. 292 removes *Nevada Revised Statutes* requirements on the internal structure of political parties in Nevada pursuant to the U.S. Supreme Court decision on the *Democratic Party v. Wisconsin ex rel. La Follette*, 450 U.S. 107 (1981).

CHAIR BROOKS:

Why did the Office submit the fiscal note on S.B. 292, and how did it arrive at the amount specified in the fiscal note?

MARK WLASCHIN (Deputy Secretary of State for Elections, Elections Division, Office of the Secretary of State):

The Office identified that the passing of S.B. 292 would result in a fiscal impact of approximately \$660,000 because of the required voter education campaign. This requirement is derived from section 4 of S.B. 292 which specifies the need for a voter education program with information concerning STV.

The cost estimate for this voter education campaign was modeled, in part, after the voter education campaign conducted upon the passage of Assembly Bill (A.B.) No. 4 of the 32nd Special Session. The goal would be to not spend all of the requested funds, but rather provide information to the electorate in the most cost efficient manner and return any remaining balance to the General Fund.

The voter education campaign would provide specific reassurance to your constituents about STV. The Office learned in the 2020 election cycle a sea change has occurred. The electorate is now hungrier for information about changes in election law than they have been in the past two decades.

If S.B. 292 is passed, voters would certainly attempt to educate themselves on what STV means. They would also quickly learn courts or legislatures of 16 different states have already repealed STV in some form. This will cause significant concern and confusion across the State. Consequently, the Office will specifically focus on a targeted voter education campaign.

The Office's unified voter education campaign initiated at the State-level will work with local advocacy groups, county clerks and elected officials to explain the process to voters so they better understand how STV works in relation to major and minor political parties.

The education campaign will address how STV does not prevent down-ballot changes and how it requires voter input on nonpartisan races and ballot questions. Without a focused education campaign effort, voter confusion will increase and confidence in the electoral process will decrease.

The Office's total marketing budget as an agency is \$900 per fiscal year, and none of those funds are allocated to the elections budget. The marketing budget is only for commercial recordings which are low cost and need very little advertising. For that reason, the Office has identified a fiscal impact to the agency if S.B. 292 passes.

CHAIR BROOKS:

Section 4 of S.B. 292 states "the county or city clerk shall provide a voter education program specific to the voting system used by the county or city." This statement could be interpreted in different ways by the county and city clerks. Why does the Office believe this passage directs it to do anything at all?

MR. WLASCHIN:

A Statewide unified effort is the most effective means to communicate with the electorate. At the State level, the goal is to rebuild voter confidence. To support this effort, the counties have verified with their vendors that the systems which are in place are able to be modified. There will not be any further requirement for the counties other than notifying and explaining to the electorate what STV means and their voting options. The electorate in each county is hearing from their respective county clerk.

CHAIR BROOKS:

Is there any one thing written in section 4 of S.B. 292 which directs the Office to do anything at all?

MR. WLASCHIN:

Not specifically. The Office interprets this specific passage from section 4 of S.B. 292 to be implied based on its experience during the 2020 election cycle and the amount of confusion which subsequently arose due to the changes in election law.

CHAIR BROOKS:

Senator Lange, as the sponsor of S.B. 292, was it the intent for the Office to do any voter outreach at all?

SENATOR LANGE:

No. The intent was for the counties to communicate and educate the electorate as they regularly communicate with them by sending out voter guides before the election. We thought the best way for the voters to get information would be through the counties.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Would we expect the chief elections officer of the State to do zero outreach regarding a massive change to Nevada's election procedures which many states are actually abandoning at this point?

SENATOR LANGE:

We would expect the counties to do the same outreach they always provide to voters and to be consistent with what voters are used to.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Would there be changes to the voter guides mailed out prior to elections?

SENATOR LANGE:

I would think the counties will note changes on the front of the voter guides to alert voters to any changes. The counties regularly communicate to voters and voters are used to receiving communication from the counties through voter guides, Facebook and Twitter. There are many different formats used for voters to get this information.

The fiscal note attached to Amendment No. 230 to S.B. 292, as adopted, allows the Legislative Commission to cover voter education costs as well as costs incurred for special elections.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

When changes were incorporated regarding mail-in ballots for the 2020 primary and general elections, did the Office spend time and money on messaging?

MR. WLASCHIN:

Yes. The Office worked with an outside contractor because, as previously noted, it does not have a marketing budget. In recognizing the importance of changes to any election law, a determination was made to reach out to the electorate by the most effective means possible in order to maximize impact.

It was important to the Office to carefully discuss and convey what communication should look like and to accomplish it in the most cost-efficient manner possible to not waste taxpayer dollars. Significant staff time was allocated to the crafting of the message and making sure the word got out to the electorate as appropriate.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

When the counties notify voters of changes through messaging materials or on ballots, do any of those materials first go to the Office for review? Is it a centralized process?

MR. WLASCHIN:

Yes. The Office does review materials. However, it does not control the clerks of the registrars who work for their respective board of county commissioners. The Office provides assistance and oversight in reviewing documents but ultimately what is published is up to the county clerks.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

Having served on elections and procedures for the Assembly and now for the Senate, I recognize it is confusing for voters when changes are made to the ballot's layout and how votes are indicated. I understand there would be an option for STV as well as an option to change selections as voters go down the ballot.

If S.B. 292 does pass, it is important voters understand the process and how to easily opt in or opt out of their selections. Senator Lange, I appreciate this was put into the language of S.B. 292, but technology and how screens look can be confusing to voters. I am concerned the messaging gets out. I appreciate the work the Office has done around this issue.

CHAIR BROOKS:

In past elections, how were county-incurred costs handled?

MR. WLASCHIN:

It depends on the nature of the expense. In regard to mail-in ballots, there is a cost to the paper stock used. Those expenses are referred back to the Office. If there were unfunded mandates at the State level, the counties would identify those costs and bring them to our attention. The Office would use monies from the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) grant to compensate the counties for those costs.

CHAIR BROOKS:

If I understand correctly, the HAVA grant supports voting operations. Has the Office used HAVA grant funds in the past to support counties if they had additional costs associated with voting operations?

MR. WLASCHIN:

Yes. The HAVA grant is specifically intended for improvements to the administration of federal elections. Anything related to that can be applied towards the HAVA grant.

SENATOR LANGE:

To clarify, the fiscal notes on S.B. 292 are in the event there is a special U.S. House of Representatives election. If that were to happen, it would cost the counties money to run the special election.

CHAIR BROOKS:

We have established a clear legislative record on the intent of S.B. 292 and how it addresses voter education.

GENNADY STOLYAROV (Chief Executive, Nevada Transhumanist Party; Chairman, U.S. Transhumanist Party):

I submitted written testimony ([Exhibit B](#)). I strongly urge you to oppose S.B. 292. Section 2 of S.B. 292, as amended, will have adverse fiscal impacts. The equal apportionment requirement for petition signatures makes it practically impossible for a minor political party to qualify by petition and unnecessarily burdens the Office.

To validate a signature, the Office currently considers whether the individual petition signature belongs to a registered voter in the State. Section 2 of S.B. 292 will pose the additional burden of verifying that the signatures are equally apportioned among the four petition districts in Nevada. This could lead to a significant expenditure of time and resources beyond what can be formally budgeted for.

Requiring equal apportionment renders it almost effortless for a major party to challenge petitions submitted by minor parties by simply counting signatures from each district and noting any difference in the numbers of signatures even if it is just one signature.

Section 2 of S.B. 292, as amended, would not allow any deviation from a strictly equal apportionment. While it would be easy for major political parties to challenge a minor party's petition under these circumstances, it would create more difficulties for the Office and the State's judicial system because more challenges would be initiated.

The fiscal burdens and risks S.B. 292 imposes upon the State have no offsetting benefits. Senate Bill 292 exacerbates a highly polarized political situation, disenfranchises supporters of minor parties and restricts voter choice. At a time of great fiscal strain to the State and immense economic hardship for

its citizens, it is highly imprudent to impose additional costs upon the State for the purpose of raising the barriers to ballot access for minor political parties.

JANINE HANSEN (Independent American Party of Nevada):

We oppose S.B. 292. Testimony in opposition of S.B. 292 can be found in my written testimony submitted for S.B. 292 ([Exhibit C](#)).

KIMBERLY FERGUS:

I oppose S.B. 292. I hope the Senators remember it is "we the people," not we the party. The State cannot afford this. We had many challenges in our 2020 election. I worked on the election integrity team. I am still fighting with those who think we are not doing enough and who believe the Office is not doing anything to help with voter integrity.

Voting is the one thing which is precious to the American patriot, and I do not understand why there are so many shenanigans going on with voting. Do what your constituents put you in office to do and vote no on STV.

RICHARD CLARK:

I oppose S.B. 292. I am a teacher in Washoe County School District. I have spent the last 18 years teaching students how to citizen and to understand their votes matter. I have learned it is not just voting that is important, but it is the candidates whose name is on the ballot as well as the office they are running for. I have been spending time with my students during the last few election cycles teaching them the importance of knowing who is running for what and why they are qualified.

A number of positions in the State at the county level are partisan including the county administrator, county assessor and county clerk. However, these positions are filled by people who are not partisan by nature. Their roles are not to invoke policy but to enforce policy.

Senate Bill 292 is regressive. This "stinks of hyperpartisanship" in a world of already too much hyperpartisanship which represents a winner take all mentality.

We need voters to not only take the time to vote and to have better access to the ballot, but also to be better informed on who they are voting for. Voting for a single party is not it. James Madison said, "Government is not run by angels."

We need to make sure people running for office, whether Republican, Democrat, nonpartisan or third party are qualified for the job not because they have an elephant or donkey next to their name.

RICHARD WINGER (Coalition for Free and Open Elections):

I will address the section of S.B. 292 which moves the petition deadline several weeks earlier. I am surprised the consultant does not mention more about this part of S.B. 292. It is very likely to be held unconstitutional. States end up paying high attorney fees when they lose constitutional voting rights cases. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit said June is too early.

A cursory reading of S.B. 292 might lead you to believe the petition deadline would occur in early June. The Nevada election code describes the deadline for the Office to receive the signatures which is a month earlier. Signatures are then completed and turned into the counties.

A chart in my newsletter, *Ballot Access News*, shows 53 court cases which struck down early petition deadlines. Two of those cases are in Nevada. Six cases struck down a June deadline, and two cases struck down a May deadline.

Take out the part of S.B. 292 which changes the petition deadline. It has been ten years since any party's petition has succeeded in Nevada—this alone shows it is too hard, and it makes no sense to make it even more difficult.

BOB RUSSO:

I oppose S.B. 292. The major problem I see in our Country today is an electorate becoming less informed on how government functions and consequently voting based on emotion and what the government is willing to give the voter. Voting is an incredible gift we each take to the voting booth.

Before we buy a new car, we do research. We should do the same before voting and carefully review each candidate to make sure they support the values we hold dear as Americans. Senate Bill 292 and STV does just the opposite. It devalues voting. It encourages people to be lax and neglectful about voting. It could cause some members of the Legislature who are doing a good job to be voted out of office.

I understand S.B. 292 would transfer the power to fill legislative vacancies from the counties to the State Legislature or away from county commissioners. I do not favor this. It should be noted straight-ticket voting has been tried in 16 states and invalidated which was the case in Utah last year.

I believe the more informed the electorate is about the candidates they elect, the better qualified the candidates will be to serve the people they represent. I urge you to vote for an informed and educated electorate by voting no on S.B. 292.

DAN TWEDT:

I oppose S.B. 292. It represents no less than another incremental and clear and present danger to the founding values of our democratic republic. Any astute observer can see well-informed citizen engagement, robust voting rights and broad and civil discourse are under attack as never before in our Country's history. There is clearly a tide of antidemocratic, nativist and populist fever on the rise, not just here in America but, disturbingly, in many countries.

Now must be the time for America and her proudly innovative states such as Nevada to support America's presumptive status as leader of the free world. Senate Bill 292 represents another straw placed on the straining back of these citizen engagement values we seek to teach others in the world to emulate. Misguided legislation such as S.B. 292 will further entrench us with an un-American two-party political monopoly. It is dangerous and wrong. Do not send antidemocratic signals to a world hungry for leadership.

Senate Bill 292 sends the wrong message by severely curtailing our better political options and sacrifices reasoned discourse on the altar of centralized political trench warfare. I strongly urge a vote against S.B. 292.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I close the hearing on S.B. 292. We move to S.B. 425.

SENATE BILL 425: Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Division of Internal Audits of the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor for an unanticipated shortfall related to payroll. (BDR S-1053)

SUSAN BROWN (Director, Office of Finance, Office of the Governor):

Senate Bill 425 requests a supplemental appropriation for the Office of the Governor, Office of Finance (GFO), Division of Internal Audits for a shortfall in the personnel services category. When determining budget reserves during the 32nd Special Session, additional money was identified for reduction in the personnel services category in error. The error caused a shortfall of approximately \$76,807 in this account.

Approving S.B. 425 will ensure the Division on Internal Audits has adequate authority to pay all personnel costs through the end of FY 2020-2021.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I close the hearing on S.B. 425. We move to S.B. 426.

SENATE BILL 426: Makes an appropriation to the Office of Finance in the Office of the Governor as a loan for the replacement of the content management and portal platform. (BDR S-1115)

MATTHEW TUMA (Deputy Director, Department of Administration):

Senate Bill 426 is a budget implementation bill and part of the Executive Budget. It is a one-shot appropriation of \$1,784,500 as a General Fund loan to the Department of Administration's Enterprise Information Technology Services (EITS) for a replacement of the enterprise web content management system (CMS) and portal platform.

FY 2021 One-Shot: This request provides a General Fund loan to Enterprise Information Technology Services for the replacement of the Content Management and Portal platform. (BUDGET OVERVIEW-21)

The project was approved during the Eightieth Legislative Session. The funds were reverted during the 2021-2023 biennium due to budget reductions. Senate Bill 426 is a rerequest for the same project.

ALAN CUNNINGHAM (State Chief Information Officer, Division of Enterprise Information Technology Services, Department of Administration):

Senate Bill 426 makes an appropriation to the GFO as a loan for the replacement of the current CMS and portal platform.

The enterprise CMS most State agencies use for their websites is called Ektron. The Ektron CMS and portal platform was put in place in 2009. It depreciated in 2014. The EITS team has been constantly challenged to keep it functioning effectively for the last seven years as technology and security demands from State agencies have increased. The system is not conforming to State security policy as it runs on an unsupported version of the .NET Framework which is an open sourced developer platform.

The funding in S.B. 426 is vital to the continuity and future improvement of cybersecurity functionality and American's with Disabilities Act compliance for the 115 State websites using the Ektron-based CMS. Updated capability should also attract some of the 66 websites from the State agencies not now using the State CMS system.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is it a new process to set up a one-shot appropriation as a loan to be paid back over two biennia? I do not remember seeing a loan like this before.

MR. THORLEY:

When a General Fund loan is provided to an enterprise fund, it is typically provided as a loan rather than a straight appropriation. The loan repayment period over two biennia is common.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

This is the first time I remember seeing this loan as well. Why are we not doing a direct appropriation? What is the advantage of going into the enterprise fund and subsequent repayment?

MR. THORLEY:

The EITS Division does not receive General Fund appropriations in the Executive Budget as it is an enterprise fund supported by the fees EITS charges its customers which are the State agencies.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

Can EITS not accept General Fund appropriations? If we appropriate it, I would think EITS could accept it.

MR. THORLEY:

The EITS Division would accept the General Fund loan for approximately \$1.8 million and will pay it off beginning in FY 2023-2024. The payments will be no less than 25 percent of the loan. The loan repayment will come out of the user fees or the rates EITS charges its customers. In the end, the ratepayers will pay for this loan. It will not come out of the General Fund.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

To confirm, EITS cannot accept General Fund appropriations?

MR. THORLEY:

It would be a departure from past practice.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I close the hearing on S.B. 426. We move to S.B. 427.

SENATE BILL 427: Makes appropriations to the Division of Child and Family Services of the Department of Health and Human Services for deferred maintenance projects at certain facilities. (BDR S-1123)

MANDI DAVIS (Deputy Administrator, Administrator Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services):

Senate Bill 427 would appropriate \$766,561 to the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) for deferred maintenance projects and replacement equipment for the DCFS facilities throughout the State.

Section 1 of S.B. 427 applies to deferred maintenance projects for the Summit View Youth Center. Section 2 of S.B. 427 appropriates monies for replacement equipment for the Caliente Youth Center. Section 3 of S.B. 427 funds the deferred maintenance projects at the Nevada Youth Training Center. Section 4 of S.B. 427 funds the deferred maintenance projects at the Southern Nevada Child and Adolescent Services Campus.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I close the hearing on S.B. 427. We move to S.B. 428.

SENATE BILL 428: Makes appropriations to the Nevada Highway Patrol Division of the Department of Public Safety for the replacement of vehicles and motorcycles and certain equipment. (BDR S-1129)

MARTIN MLECZKO (Captain, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety):

Section 1 of S.B. 428 funds the replacement of fleet vehicles and associated special equipment. Section 2 of S.B. 428 funds the replacement of fleet motorcycles and their associated special equipment. Section 3 of S.B. 428 funds the purchase of Oral Fluid Mobile Analyzer systems to be used for alcohol-related offenses.

Section 4 of S.B. 428 funds the replacement of the Nevada Highway Patrol's (NHP) mobile data computer tablets. Section 5 of S.B. 428 funds the purchase of equipment items for the NHP's multidisciplinary investigation and reconstruction teams. Section 6 of S.B. 428 funds the replacement of printers and their associated mobile adapters. Section 7 of S.B. 428 funds the replacement of computer hardware and software.

Chair, I would like to recommend a conceptual amendment to S.B. 428. May I proceed?

CHAIR BROOKS:

Has this conceptual amendment been submitted by the NHP to our Fiscal staff?

MR. MLECZKO:

Not as of yet. This clarification just came to the NHP's attention.

CHAIR BROOKS:

Please proceed.

MR. MLECZKO:

The conceptual amendment would change alcohol-related offenses to drug-related offenses in section 3 of S.B. 428. The NHP will submit the conceptual amendment in writing to the Senate Committee on Finance following the hearing.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

In respect to the proposed conceptual amendment in section 3 of S.B. 428, if the NHP needed \$400,750 for alcohol-related offenses, why is there not additional monies requested for the expense of drug-related offenses?

MR. MLECZKO:

The proposed conceptual amendment would change the language from alcohol to drug. Section 3 of S.B. 428 funds the purchase of Oral Fluid Mobile Analyzer systems which test for drug-related or narcotic offenses. The NHP uses Preliminary Breath Tests as field sobriety tests for alcohol-related offenses.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Is the dollar amount requested in the original print of S.B. 428 still necessary or are we contemplating different products for alcohol-related offenses versus drug-related offenses?

SHERRI BRUEGGEMANN (Deputy Director, Department of Public Safety):

There was an error made in the printing of S.B. 428. The language was mistaken for alcohol-related offenses when in fact it is drug-related offenses. It is an error in word choice only.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

As shown in section 3 of S.B. 428, is \$400,750 how much the NHP needs for all testing equipment for drug-related offenses?

MS. BRUEGGEMANN:

Yes.

CHAIR BROOKS:

What type of motorcycles are used for the NHP fleet?

MR. MLECZKO:

The NHP is purchasing BMW's.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I close the hearing on S.B. 428. We move to S.B. 429.

SENATE BILL 429: Makes a supplemental appropriation to the Office of the Attorney General for a projected shortfall related to extradition costs.
(BDR S-1146)

JESSICA HOBAN (Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Attorney General):

The request for the supplemental appropriation is through the Office of the Attorney General's Office of Extradition Coordinator budget account 101-1002.

The extradition budget account provides for the transport of people who have an outstanding warrant and have been taken into custody in another state. They are being brought back to Nevada to stand trial or have their case heard in relation to their outstanding warrant.

ELECTED OFFICIALS

AG - Extradition Coordinator — Budget Page ELECTED-96 (Volume I) Budget Account 101-1002

In FY 2018-2019, in compliance with section 33 of A.B. No. 543 of the 80th Session, the Office of the Attorney General requested a transfer of \$160,266 from the FY 2020-2021 appropriation and moved it into FY 2019-2020 to cover a shortfall in the budget.

Supplemental appropriations are requested to cover in situations like this when a transfer has occurred. However, for this particular program, supplemental appropriation was not requested prior to S.B. 429. In addition to the shortfall which the Attorney General's Office started FY 2020-2021 with as a result of the prior year transfer in FY 2019-2020, the Office is also seeing a shortfall of funding in FY 2020-2021.

In addition to the transfer which occurred in FY 2019-2020 from the FY 2020-2021 appropriation, there are additional costs associated with the coronavirus pandemic. Travel restrictions have limited our ability to transport people who are incarcerated and bring them across state lines through normal land transport means. During the pandemic, the Attorney General's Office has had to provide the transports via air which does incur additional costs.

The Attorney General's Office is projecting a total need of \$350,254 which is the amount requested in S.B. 429 for a supplemental appropriation in FY 2020-2021 so the Office can cover its projected costs for extraditions through the end of the fiscal year.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

How much do we typically appropriate for extraditions on a biennial basis?

MR. THORLEY:

We will look at those numbers and provide them to the Committee.

Senate Committee on Finance
May 5, 2021
Page 18

CHAIR BROOKS:

I close the hearing on S.B. 429. That concludes our agenda items. This meeting is adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Melodie Swanson,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Chris Brooks, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Begins on Page	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
S.B. 292	B	1	Gennady Stolyarov	Public Comment in Opposition
S.B. 292	C	1	Janine Hansen	Public Comment in Opposition