

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**Eighty-first Session  
May 30, 2021**

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chair Chris Brooks at 11:23 a.m. on Sunday, May 30, 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:**

Assemblywoman Bea Duran, Assembly District No. 11  
Assemblywoman Cecilia Gonzalez, Assembly District No. 16  
Assemblywoman Rochelle Nguyen, Assembly District No. 10  
Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15  
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Wayne Thorley, Senate Fiscal Analyst  
Alex Haartz, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst  
Eileen O'Grady, Counsel  
Dan Crossman, Legislative Auditor  
Brenda Erdoes, Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau  
Joko Cailles, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Victor Salcido, Charter School Association of Nevada  
Jessica Barlow Daniels, Executive Director and Principal, Carson Montessori  
Charter School  
Maria Rogers, Vice President, Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School  
Tambre Tondryk, Executive Director of Operations, Beacon Academy of Nevada  
Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association  
Brian Rippet, President, Nevada State Education Association  
John Sande IV, Nevada Connections Education Academy  
Samantha Glover  
Lindsay Anderson, Washoe County School District  
Brad Keating, Clark County School District  
Sarah Adler, Charter School Association of Nevada  
Maria-Teresa Liebermann-Parraga, Battle Born Progress  
Leann McAllister, Executive Director, Nevada Chapter of American Academy of  
Pediatrics  
Jeri Burton, President, Nevada Chapter of Naturalization for Women  
Holly Welborne, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada  
Chris DeRicco, Chairman, Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners  
Jorja Powers, Chief, Offender Management Division, Nevada Department of  
Corrections  
Kendra Bertschy, Washoe County Public Defender's Office  
John Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office  
Jodi Hocking, Founder, Return Strong: Families United for Justice for the  
Incarcerated  
Jagada Chambers, Rights Restoration Coordinator, Silver State Voices  
Morgan Darcy  
Denise Bolaños, Return Strong: Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated  
Nicole Williams  
Desiree Miller  
Yah Yah Oglesby  
Charrise Lothamer  
Victoria Gonzalez, Executive Director, Department of Sentencing Policy  
Tom Lawson, Chief, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public  
Safety  
Warren Hardy, Council for a Better Nevada  
Steve Fisher, Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services,  
Department of Health and Human Services

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 30, 2021  
Page 3

Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices  
Eric Jeng, Asian Community Development Council  
Anwar Green  
Jennifer Fleischmann, Co-Director of Organizing, Make the Road Nevada  
Cecia Alvarado, Nevada State Director, Mi Familia Vota  
Kerry Durmick, Nevada Director, All Voting is Local  
Taylor Patterson, Bishop Paiute Tribe; Executive Director, Native Voters Alliance  
Nevada  
Tammi Tiger, Chair, Board of Directors, Las Vegas Indian Center  
Alyssa Cortes, Executive Director, Silver State Equality

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 463.

**SENATE BILL 463**: Makes an appropriation to the Department of Education for transfer to certain charter schools. (BDR S-1181)

WAYNE THORLEY (Senate Fiscal Analyst):

Senate Bill 463 makes an appropriation to the Department of Education (NDE) for transfer to certain charter schools. The total amount of the appropriation is \$3.8 million, which can be found in section 1, subsection 1 of the bill. However, it is broken out into two parts with the second part in section 1, subsection 2. A total of just over \$2 million is available in fiscal year (FY) 2021-2022 as bridge funding for the 12 charter schools listed in section 1, subsection 6 of S.B. 463. In FY 2022-2023, a total of \$1.7 million is available to the nine charter schools listed in section 1, subsection 7.

Section 1, subsections 6 and 7 list the charter schools eligible for this one-time bridge funding and the maximum transfer amount that can be provided to these charter schools. The numbers are based on projections. The identification of these charter schools as being funded less than the FY 2020-2021 hold harmless amount is based on enrollment projections.

If the actual enrollment for these charter schools come in lower than projections and subsequently they are not below their hold harmless level, there will be a true-up at the end of each fiscal year, and they will not get the additional funding. The NDE will give quarterly payments to these charter schools in equal amounts that equal the maximum transfer amount, and there will be a true-up at the end. The charter schools may have to revert funding if they are not below

their hold harmless amount. The same is true for the dollar amounts in section 1, subsection 7 for the nine charter schools listed. Three charter schools from FY 2022-2023 drop off and are not included. Senate Bill 463 becomes effective upon passage and approval.

SENATOR DENIS:

Originally when we talked about this legislation there were different numbers of charter schools. How did we get to the number of charter schools listed?

MR. THORLEY:

When this question first came up in committee, Fiscal staff did a quick estimate of what we thought it might be. That is where the original seven charter schools came from. After doing a full analysis, it was determined there are 12 charter schools in 2021-2022 and 9 charter schools in FY 2022-2023 that, as budgeted with the predications, would be below their FY 2020-2021 hold harmless amount. There are two charter schools that are not included in S.B. 463 and were excluded from our analysis. They are also projected to be below their FY 2020-2021 hold harmless level, but they are projected to have significant decreases in enrollment in the upcoming biennium due to closure of charter campuses. They were anomalies.

SENATOR DENIS:

From what I see, the largest discrepancy is for Beacon Academy?

MR. THORLEY:

Correct. As a raw dollar amount, the largest bridge funding amount would be provided to Beacon Academy. It is \$549,864 in FY 2021-2022 and \$513,388 in FY 2022-2023.

SENATOR DENIS:

Some of these amounts are close, we do not need to make a large investment.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

Will the enrollment in these charter schools be tracked on a quarterly basis to match the quarterly payments being disbursed, or do they adjust the amount at the end of the year?

MR. THORLEY:

The true-up will occur at the end of the fiscal year. The charter schools will receive the four quarterly payments that add up to the maximum transfer amount. Then, at the end of the year, when actual enrollment is known there will be a true-up. There will not be iterative true-ups throughout the fiscal year.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

For that true-up, the counts that matter are the beginning enrollment and the ending enrollment? These charter schools may have to set aside money if they lose enrollment. In universities, many times people will move around after the first year. I would like to know the timing of the counts if it is not quarterly. Other schools do counts throughout the year.

MR. THORLEY:

Fiscal staff's understanding is this is based on the audit and enrollment counts.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I have been contacted by one of the charter schools in my district that think they should be on this list and they are not. Has communication happened between Fiscal staff and the Charter School Authority to confirm the list, so we are not leaving a school off that should be on the list?

MR. THORLEY:

Fiscal staff has had discussions with the Charter School Authority. I do not believe discussions have taken place on the individual school level. I am happy to provide information on the specific charter schools included.

VICTOR SALCIDO (Charter School Association of Nevada):

For two years, it has been said no school would be in a worse position as a result of this new funding formula. Senate Bill 463 gets us to that promise.

JESSICA BARLOW DANIELS (Executive Director and Principal, Carson Montessori Charter School):

Our student legislative team wanted to say thank you for providing great civics in action learning opportunities for us this year. Carson Montessori is a Governor-designated science, technology, engineering and mathematics school. If there is not enough money in the budget to buy supplies and materials, staff and students can submit a proposal. If it is doable, workable and feasible, it is launched within 48 hours. I personally pay for it out of my own pocket. When

S.B. 439 first came out, and it did not provide the same cost-adjustments for charter schools that it did for district schools, we feared we would have to commence a process of closing over a few years.

You have listened to us and our advocates. You have responded in a way that allows us to continue with our mission. The students, families and staff of Carson Montessori thank you for realizing this funding needs to happen. The district-sponsored schools need to be included in the financial equation. The changes you have proposed this morning are doable, workable and feasible. We thank you for supporting education and the children of Nevada. Well done.

MARIA ROGERS (Vice President, Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School):

I am a former parent member of two children who graduated from Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School. My expertise is in finance and human resources. I support S.B. 463 as we are one of the charter schools included in the bill. We were granted a charter 22 years ago by Washoe County School District (WCSD) as the first elementary charter school in Nevada serving grades K-8.

We are a small and mighty four-star community school that fosters personalized learning. We serve over 360 students in the North Valleys of Reno, and we are about to fulfill our dream of adding high school as our new building is set to open in August of this year. We are in construction to build a second site for our middle school students and are expanding into high school with a capacity at the new site of 740 students on that campus. We serve a 98 percent diverse group of students who are at risk for not graduating high school based on State definition of at-risk, including approximately 50 percent of students who participate in the free-reduced-price breakfast lunch program. We appreciate your assistance in transitioning to the pupil-centered funding formula and encourage the passage of S.B. 463. This is crucial to our longevity and the charter school community.

TAMBRE TONDRYK (Executive Director of Operations, Beacon Academy of Nevada):

Under the new State funding formula, Beacon Academy is set to receive less funding, directly impacting the education of Nevada's most at-risk high school students. The students enrolled in Beacon Academy are severely credit-deficient and typically graduate during their fifth, sixth or even seventh year of high school. Other qualifying conditions include those on probation, parole, expelled, suspended or qualifying as a special education student.

I support S.B. 463. The funding provided by this bill is critical to our school as the State transitions to the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan. Without the additional funds, we will not be able to sustain the same level of social, emotional and academic support provided to our students.

CHRIS DALY (Nevada State Education Association):

I present opposition testimony ([Exhibit B](#)) to S.B. 463. I would also add we are aware the bail-out of these charter schools is a part of the late in-Session political process. It would be great if the school districts that also need the help would get that helping hand.

BRIAN RIPPET (President, Nevada State Education Association):

I want to highlight some of the concerns with the lack of increased cost of doing business for the rural school districts. While I can appreciate the great deal of effort and time taken to ensure that a handful of charter schools are getting to a place where they believe they are held harmless, I have great concern for rural school districts. My own home district, Elko, Esmerelda, Eureka and here in Carson City have not had any adjustment for inflation. They will effectively have reduced ability to hold onto their teaching staff and educators. In Douglas County it would be about a \$2 million reduction in spending power, which is approximately 22-to-25 teachers. This would wipe out a set of schools in a portion of the County. In Elko, they would need about \$4 million to be truly held harmless in terms of inflation costs of doing business. With the same attention and care we gave to the charter schools, I hope we focus that attention on what we are calling the hold harmless school districts.

JOHN SANDE IV (Nevada Connections Academy):

Nevada Connections Academy is a virtual education provider in the State. We are not on the list of S.B. 463. I do understand there are a number of people who have looked at the numbers and disagree about who may or may not be losing funding due to moving to the pupil-centered funding formula. However, the language in section 1 says "the potential" and that language shows an intent to give leeway to those who may or may not be on that line. If the Committee would entertain it, we would appreciate it if Nevada Connections Academy could be included on the list of schools that could potentially lose funding. We support the concepts of S.B. 463 as we make this transition.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 463, and I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 224.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 224 (2nd Reprint)**: Provides for access to menstrual products in certain public schools. (BDR 34-767)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BEA DURAN (Assembly District No. 11):

Assembly Bill 224 provides access to menstrual products in certain restrooms in public middle schools, junior high schools, high schools and charter schools at no cost to the students. This bill was brought to our attention by Samantha Glover to promote menstrual equity and decrease the stigma around period poverty. In addition, teachers were paying out of pocket for these necessary period products for students who did not have access or who have maybe started their period unexpectedly. Five other states that provided free period products saw that attendance rose by 2.4 percent.

SAMANTHA GLOVER:

I am a 16 year old high school student from Reno. I initially brought forward the issue of period product poverty to Assemblywoman Duran's attention and ask you to imagine what it would be like for students in Nevada if they were asked to carry around toilet paper, hand soap and other essential hygiene items just in case. This is a reality for every menstruating student in Nevada. One in four students have missed class time because they did not have access to menstrual products. Today I am representing 717 students, teachers and educators, along with 19 other organizations that have signed on in support of A.B. 224.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

Right now in adult restrooms if you go to the airport or someplace else, supplies are sitting at the bottom of a dispenser. How will these products be disbursed? Will there be a device for young ladies to use?

Ms. GLOVER:

Recently, Denver Public Schools, along with the State of Washington, have implemented this kind of legislation inside their school districts. The dispensers are clear acrylic \$23 dispensers which have pads and tampons on both sides of the dispenser. It is easy to refill, and they mount onto a bathroom wall.



LINDSAY ANDERSON (Washoe County School District):

We did submit a revised fiscal note based on the second reprint of A.B. 224, which creates a pilot project during this biennium where 25 percent of our schools will be receiving these dispensers. Full implementation will occur in the next biennium. Our fiscal note includes an estimated cost of \$20,000 for the products for the 25 percent of our schools. That is an ongoing cost to the district. There will be a \$7,200 cost for the dispensers and installation. As Ms. Glover stated, there may be less expensive options, but we are subject to the procurement laws as outlined in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 332. We are estimating the cost based on what available information we have.

CHAIR BROOKS:

This is the unsolicited fiscal note from WCSD?

MS. ANDERSON:

That is correct. The unsolicited fiscal note reflects the first reprint of A.B. 224.

BRAD KEATING (Clark County School District):

Along with the unsolicited fiscal note based on the amendment of A.B. 224, Clark County School District (CCSD) has a fiscal note which has a total of 32 schools that would be affected by this legislation as part of the pilot program. The first year's fiscal impact would be about \$157,000, or \$4,900 per school to cover the costs of supplies and installation of dispensers at the 25 percent during the pilot program. There will be an ongoing cost of approximately \$132,000 for additional supplies each year. We have broken down how we calculated that cost. We will bring in the best provider possible at the lowest rate, so the fiscal impact may be lower than what we show today.

SARAH ADLER (Charter School Association of Nevada):

The schools we have talked with about A.B. 224 are in enthusiastic support. We have also been in contact with the State Public Charter School Authority, and they are in support of A.B. 224.

MARIA-TERESA LIEBERMANN-PARRAGA (Battle Born Progress):

We support A.B. 224. As someone who has firsthand experience with this issue, I support all students having access to menstrual products in our schools. I know what it was like to not have that access. It is desperately needed and worth the investment to keep our young people in class and meeting their health

needs. This is basic healthcare. If you can invest in products for free in this building, our young people in the State deserve the same in their schools.

LEANN MCALLISTER (Executive Director, Nevada Chapter of American Academy of Pediatrics):  
I support A.B. 224.

JERI BURTON (President, Nevada Chapter of Naturalization for Women):  
We support A.B. 224 for period equity. Period products are a necessity and must be readily available and free of charge in our schools. As mentioned, this past year one in four people with periods struggle to purchase feminine hygiene products. No one should have to miss class time or other essential school activities because they cannot afford period products.

MS. GLOVER:  
I will conclude my presentation with a quote. When New Hampshire's Governor Chris Sununu signed a similar bill into law in 2019 he said "New Hampshire's bill would help ensure young women can learn without disruption and free of shame or fear of stigma." It is my hope we can give our Nevada students that same opportunity.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:  
I was a teacher for many years, and I have three daughters. This is important.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:  
This is a great idea and a wonderful way to support young women.

CHAIR BROOKS:  
I will close the hearing on A.B. 224 and open the hearing on A.B. 241.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 241 (2nd Reprint)**: Establishes provisions governing credits on terms of imprisonment during certain declarations of emergency.  
(BDR 16-982)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CECILIA GONZALEZ (Assembly District No. 16):  
As of March 13, statistics show that Nevada's Department of Corrections (NDOC) reported 5,460 cases and 56 deaths due to Covid-19. Due to vaccines being available, we as a Country are starting to address this issue, but in the last year, we have lost people in NDOC due to Covid-19. Assembly Bill 241

gives back good time credits to offenders who would have received or earned good behavior educational attainment or the successful completion of a treatment program, therefore reducing their sentence and inmate population.

Speaking with stakeholders in the Assembly, we were able to get the fiscal notes off of A.B. 241. However, due to updated conversations, the original fiscal note submitted by the Parole Board will be reapplied. Revisions to the bill reapplied the retroactive piece under Proposed Amendment 3471 ([Exhibit C](#)). There is a reporting mechanism that within 60 days the NDOC must provide a list of inmates who would receive that information to different agencies, including the Legislature and the Governor's Office. This is also a provision stating that it is not a right for inmates. We do not want to set that expectation. Inmates will be eligible for this benefit to address this last year, but it is not something that will be given to just anyone.

HOLLY WELBORNE (Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada):  
To help understand this issue, the statutes and how this credit will accrue, I will go over A.B. 241. Section 1, subsection 1 lists out four different statutes: NRS 209.433, NRS 209.443, NRS 209.446 and NRS 209.4465. Those statutes had been amended during A.B. No. 510 of the 74th Session. Assembly Bill 241 does not touch on that complex accrual of time or the amount of time someone is incarcerated. It does touch on one provision that is present in each of those statutes where the director may allow up to ten days of credit to an offender whose diligence in labor merits such credit.

This is what is at issue with this bill. We are working to ensure that individuals are enrolled in a program such as a labor or study program. Due to restrictions during the Covid-19 pandemic, individuals were not able to participate in those programs. Those individuals lost that accrual. Families were counting on those accruals so loved ones could come home. On average, an individual gets about five days credit but some can accrue up to ten days of credit per these statutes.

What we are asking for is modest. We can give back people at least half of the time they have accrued, which is 5 days not to exceed 60 days per year. Through various amendments, we have come back to the original version of A.B. 241 that applies this benefit retroactively so those individuals who lost this time will get it back. It is important to clarify that inmates receiving credits are not obligated to have a parole hearing immediately or automatically to prevent the Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners from becoming overwhelmed.

CHAIR BROOKS:

Are these credits that would have been achieved otherwise if they were participating in the program?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZALEZ:

Yes, that is correct. The issue that occurred during the Covid-19 pandemic is the State went into a state of emergency. As a result, the State was not able to institute the program due to limited space. Assembly Bill 241 is seeking to address the credits lost that inmates would have otherwise accrued.

CHAIR BROOKS:

To get these credits, do you simply have to be enrolled as a participant, or are there specific requirements to qualify for this benefit?

MS. WELBORNE:

Typically, if you are in a workforce program or something similar, it can be merit based, but by and large you accrue the credit if you are enrolled in these programs and you are actively participating. If there is a disciplinary issue, they can take the credit off. If someone approves the credits under A.B. 241, the NDOC can assess whether or not to apply that time. The bill does state it is not guaranteeing a right to a parole hearing based on time accrual.

CHAIR BROOKS:

We will address the fiscal impact of A.B. 241. Will Proposed Amendment 3471 in [Exhibit C](#) brings back the original version of this bill?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZALEZ:

That is correct. The NDOC will be testifying their fiscal note has fallen off. Putting the retroactivity back into A.B. 241 will generate a fiscal note which is why we put the provision back into the bill. When the Parole Board is ready to do so, they can begin to hold hearings for those who have accrued credits. We are uncertain what the specific cost will be, but we are going off the original number submitted.

ALEX HAARTZ (Deputy Fiscal Analyst):

We do have a Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners Memorandum ([Exhibit D](#)) dated May 24 and an NDOC Memorandum ([Exhibit E](#)) dated May 14.

CHAIR BROOKS:

Do they reference the amended version or the original version of A.B. 241?

MR. HAARTZ:

The letter from the NDOC indicated they have withdrawn their fiscal note, which was the unsolicited fiscal note dated May 20. The letter from the Parole Board indicates that they had submitted a fiscal note on March 21, which is consistent with the unsolicited note. That letter indicates they are withdrawing that fiscal note as well.

CHRIS DERICCO (Chairman, Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners):

Our original fiscal note was submitted on March 20. That note had to do with the original version of A.B. 241, which spoke about the retroactivity. After working with the stakeholders, it came to a point in the last week where the retroactivity would be removed. That is when we were able to remove our unsolicited fiscal statement. However, recently the retroactivity language is back in the latest version of A.B. 241 so our unsolicited fiscal statement will need to be reinstituted.

CHAIR BROOKS:

Was that fiscal note for this fiscal year in the amount of \$14,000?

MR. DERICO:

That is correct. It is a one-time charge and will help us to get through these hearings which will create a surge for approximately two months.

JORJA POWERS (Chief, Offender Management Division, Nevada Department of Corrections):

Our fiscal note was written before language was taken out of the first version of A.B. 241 regarding awarding credits to the minimum term of the sentences. As long as that remains amended, we have no fiscal note.

To address the credits topic, our interpretation is we will be giving credits to everyone who has earned them. Some people did not work during the pandemic, but our prisons were still running. The offenders did have jobs and some participated in programs. The credits as we see them are exceptional merit credits for the changes and modifications to the normal operations of the prison.

CHAIR BROOKS:

Is that understanding based upon the Proposed Amendment 3471 [Exhibit C](#) posted today?

MS. POWERS:

I have not seen the conceptual language. It does not change our interpretation.

CHAIR BROOKS:

In FY 2021-2022 and FY 2022-2023 that makes sense. I do not understand the effect on future biennia and why that would not be consistent with FY 2022-2023.

MS. POWERS:

Are you talking about the original fiscal note?

CHAIR BROOKS:

I am. According to testimony from the bill sponsor, the Proposed Amendment 3471 posted today takes [A.B. 241](#) back to the original language, including this provision. I am basing my understanding on your original fiscal note.

MS. POWERS:

I do not have a copy of the original fiscal note in front of me. If the original language meant that we would give everyone time off their minimum term that would be against how some offenders already get the credit. We would have to take apart each offender's sentences if they were aggregated, disaggregate them, put the time in and then aggregate it. Looking at the time period necessary to accomplish that task showed it would take approximately four years. At this point, we have no fiscal note.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I understand now. The four years is not ongoing every biennia, it is this one and the next. We need to be clear; do we or do we not have the unsolicited fiscal note based upon this new reprint? It sounds as if this amendment that removed the fiscal note and that particular language is still in this bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZALEZ:

Where the confusion is coming from is there was an original fiscal note submitted from the NDOC because there was language which would have

included everyone in receiving this credit. We amended that language so it would only be offenders who already received programming. This would prevent a pool of everyone in the NDOC. As Ms. Powers said, it would have taken them four years to manually go in and award those credits. That issue was fixed in the first amendment. The amendment that is before you today is a result of speaking with stakeholders leading us to realize we needed to put the retroactive language back in for it to be in statute. This generated the Parole Board's fiscal note which is now back.

KENDRA BERTSCHY (Washoe County Public Defender's Office):

We support A.B. 241. You will be hearing from the impacted individuals and their family members as to the importance of this bill. As we all know due to Covid-19, those who were in custody and in a program were not able to earn those credits. This does impact them in terms of giving them the opportunity they would have received.

JOHN PIRO (Chief Deputy Public Defender, Clark County Public Defender's Office):

I echo what Ms. Bertschy said. Covid-19 slowed down the opportunity for people to attend programming and good-time credits. Assembly Bill 241 would restore that. It is a fairness measure. I want to put on the record the support of Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada and Faith in Action for A.B. 241 as they are in a different hearing.

JODI HOCKING (Founder, Return Strong: Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated):

While there were people in programming whose programming stopped, there were also people who were new to the prison and attempting to get into programming. But because the programming stopped due to Covid-19, they were never eligible. These people have been forced to sit this entire time. Normally these people receive five days of credit for programming. That comes up to 98-to-105 days depending on when we cut it off. As the Covid-19 pandemic continued, we started to see people who were past expiration. They were due for Parole Board hearings which were expiring and they were not going home. These people were staying in prison past their sentencing date. That is how A.B. 241 started.

I will give one example of a person who personifies why this matters. I have a story of a young man named Joshua Hayes. He passed away last Friday on

May 21. He was 30 years old and serving a two-to-four years sentence for a nonviolent felony. Tied to his felony and issues was substance abuse and addiction. While he was incarcerated he was diagnosed with stage 4 cancer and died shortly after his diagnosis, five days before he would have been eligible for a Parole Board hearing. If his programming days had been applied consistently throughout the pandemic, he would have been eligible for parole in February prior to being diagnosed with cancer and likely would have at least made it to the streets to see his family again and have available medical treatment. Instead, without those days applied Joshua died in hospice care.

Assembly Bill 241 is necessary for protecting incarcerated people. Unfortunately, when those credits were not applied consistently it was completely out of the control of those incarcerated and deeply impacted those who are passing expiration and their mandatory Parole Board hearing.

JAGADA CHAMBERS (Rights Restoration Coordinator, Silver State Voices):

I support A.B. 241. During the pandemic, what a regular day looked like in prison was inmates being in their cells for 23 hours and 40 minutes. Through the pandemic, the institutions turned into solitary confinement. This bill is a dose of humanity for those who are in custody.

MORGAN DARCY:

I support A.B. 241. I will piggyback off of Jodi Hocking's testimony regarding the individual who passed away while serving time. He could have been released earlier, but with the credits taken away this individual had to suffer and die at the hands of his disease while incarcerated. There are many of us who have loved ones who are suffering because of this issue. They have done their time, however it is not their fault for Covid-19 occurring and as a result those people losing their time.

DENISE BOLAÑOS (Return Strong: Families United for Justice for the Incarcerated):

I support A.B. 241 because this is time that incarcerated people will not get back otherwise. A worldwide pandemic is not something that was in anyone's control. Like protections put in place outside of prison to overcome this pandemic, incarcerated people should get that same protection. This bill is the right thing to do, and the reality is A.B. 241 is giving them what they would have had if the pandemic had not occurred in the first place.



Senate Committee on Finance  
May 30, 2021  
Page 17

NICOLE WILLIAMS:  
I support A.B. 241.

DESIREE MILLER:  
I support A.B. 241 and agree with everything already said. This bill is needed.

YAH YAH OGLESBY:  
Please pass A.B. 241. Applying programming credits normally happens to incarcerated people for work participation, education programs, work programs and being productive during their incarceration. When Covid-19 hit, those credits stopped because programming stopped. In the end, that has extended people in incarceration past their expiration date. During Covid-19, hundreds of people were incarcerated past their expiration, which not only opens up the State to lawsuit, it impacts lives and families, and leaves incarcerated people and families bearing the burden of this individually. We have to make sure that does not happen in the future. We have a moral and ethical obligation to be concerned and care for all Nevadans.

CHARRISE LOTHAMER:  
I support A.B. 241 and the importance of this bill for those incarcerated.

VICTORIA GONZALEZ (Executive Director, Department of Sentencing Policy):  
We have worked with the sponsor, Ms. Welborn, and the stakeholders regarding the projections related to the potential savings that may result from this legislation. From what we have put together, we have identified a potential savings for those who will be released and a savings to the NDOC which would offset any fiscal impact that may result from this legislation. These are projections and contained within this legislation is the requirement that the Department of Sentencing Policy receive information about those who receive credit so we can continue to work with stakeholders to determine the actual savings that may be realized and identify any additional costs the State may incur from this legislation.

MR. DERICO:  
We are neutral on A.B. 241. For clarification, I ensure that as a result of the Proposed Amendment 3471 [Exhibit C](#) our fiscal note of nearly \$14,000 is brought back.

TOM LAWSON (Chief, Division of Parole and Probation, Department of Public Safety):

The Division of Parole and Probation has not submitted a fiscal note on A.B. 241. This will impact and cause a surge increase in prerelease planning for our specialists. However, due to the limited nature of the credit application and maximum of 60 days, we will adapt and overcome that surge of release planning over several months. If the level were high enough to justify staff, we could have a staff member hired and trained in the next few months to accomplish that. Our plan is to address the surge using existing staffing.

This will cause a surge in the past parole eligibility date list, meaning people who are remaining incarcerated past their parole eligibility date. There is no way around that with a retroactive credit. Everyone should be aware that number will spike. We get questions about this every year, and there is interest in people remaining in custody beyond that.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 241 and open the hearing on A.B. 416.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 416 (2nd Reprint)**: Directs the Legislative Auditor to conduct an audit of the Nevada System of Higher Education. (BDR S-753)

WARREN HARDY (Council for a Better Nevada):

During the Question 1 campaign, we became aware of a popular public push for the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) to be audited annually. This led us to an examination of the last time the Legislature had audited NSHE, and we determined a full audit had not occurred for 30 years. Assembly Bill 416 requires the Legislative Auditor to conduct an audit of NSHE. I spent a large amount of time with the Legislative Auditor narrowing the scope of this bill. The original draft of the bill would have been the largest audit ever done by the Legislature. That is not exactly what we were trying to accomplish. We wanted to take a global look from a legislative perspective and then follow any trails that appear. The fiscal note for A.B. 416 is \$80,000 in the first biennium and then \$120,000 in the next biennium. We are wanting accountability for NSHE and their expenditures.

DAN CROSSMAN (Legislative Auditor):

We are neutral on A.B. 416. Our office is willing to conduct any audits that are requested of us by the Legislature. The legislative request requires us to look at

our resources, at the audits we have in place and schedule based on the Legislative Commission's approval of our list. Narrowing the scope on A.B. 416 does make it more manageable for our office.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 416 and open the hearing on A.B. 432.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 432 (2nd Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to elections.  
(BDR 24-1039)

ASSEMBLYMAN HOWARD WATTS (Assembly District No. 15):

The overall objective of A.B. 432 is to expand upon our proven and successful automatic voter registration (AVR) system. What we are looking to do is implement this system in other agencies and streamline ways that it works. By expanding its implementation, we can help eligible voters register to vote or maintain up-to-date name and address information. By creating efficiencies, we can create a smoother and more secure process that works for everybody—our election administrators, our service providers and voters themselves.

The impacts of the pandemic over the last year have clearly demonstrated the importance of modern and flexible election systems. Assembly Bill 432 takes steps to bring Nevada to the cutting edge of systems Nationwide. One of the key components of the bill is moving to a backend AVR, which would automatically register people to vote when they verify their citizenship and eligibility at the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) or other agency. People who are already registered to vote will have their information updated to reflect any address or other changes since they last supplied and updated that information with a State agency.

New or updated registrants will then be mailed a postcard offering them the opportunity to decline their new registration or registration change. This helps ensure we keep things running smoothly, both at the DMV and other agencies that we know have a high volume of service provided and try to get people in and out in a timely manner. Assembly Bill 432 is the most effective policy for us to add eligible voters to the rolls and get accurate information for our voters. The process laid out in the bill ensures that people who are not eligible are protected from any inadvertent interactions with our AVR system.

The other primary component of A.B. 432 is it expands the AVR system both to the Silver State Health Insurance Exchange (SSHE) and to the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Division of Welfare and Supportive Services (DWSS) when processing applications for Medicaid. Those served through Medicaid are less likely to engage with the DMV; they are a differently situated population more likely to rely on public transportation or the assistance of family and friends to get to and from places. These agencies in particular through the work they do getting people to sign up for healthcare coverage collect information that helps identify voters and verify their eligibility, including citizenship and age information. It is worth noting that similar to the DMV, these agencies are "motor voter" agencies that must offer the opportunity to register to vote. Implementing A.B. 432 allows those agencies to streamline those practices so they can focus on delivering service to Nevada families.

Extending this legislation to Medicaid would ensure more Nevadan's can take advantage of this streamlined, convenient option to keep their registration updated as they move or register for the first time. It benefits not only people without driver's licenses and low-income families but also elderly people with disabilities and more. Civic participation is linked to improved health outcomes.

Additionally, A.B. 432 allows for other State agencies and tribal governments to opt into becoming voter registration agencies in consultation with the Governor's Office to determine if they have the information and ability to set up the systems. The goal is when people are interacting with their government, we can use that to keep our voter rolls up-to-date. To reiterate, people can opt out of this program at any time. As someone who has personally spent many hours registering people to vote, I know firsthand how these improvements reduce the opportunity for human error and utilize technology to improve the experience for voters and the processing involved for our election officials.

CHAIR BROOKS:

Appropriations are listed in A.B. 432. This is also the second reprint. I am trying to track how expensive this bill is. It does not appear the appropriations made would address the SSHE or the DWSS fiscal notes. Did the second reprint of A.B. 432 make amendments which add or remove those fiscal notes?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

I will speak to both of these amendments and the impacts they had. In conversations with the agencies and others, the original timeline on A.B. 432

had implementation by January 2022. Given the other things we are contemplating for addressing our election system, it was determined that would be a challenge. In addition, there is another measure that we are considering to change the voter registration system from a so-called "bottom-up" system to a "top-down" system. That transformation would have benefits in the expansion of AVR. The effective date of that legislation is in January of 2024.

The first reprint of A.B. 432 moved out the implementation date from 2022 to 2024 to help align and alleviate those issues. As a result, the DWSS sent in an unsolicited fiscal note indicating with that lengthened implementation timeline their fiscal note was zero. The SSHE indicated they would likely have some cost in future biennia but none in this biennium. Those changes just left the Secretary of State's Office with minor programming costs for the DMV related to the modification of their current AVR system.

The second reprint of A.B. 432 includes the appropriations to cover those costs. The Secretary of State's office did not modify their fiscal note based on the extended timeline. We know they will incur those costs at some point, and the second reprint contains the appropriations to cover those outstanding notes. It is my understanding in the second reprint that all of the fiscal items had been addressed, either through the removal of fiscal notes, or the removal of fiscal impact for the biennium or an appropriation.

CHAIR BROOKS:

When we speak of the DWSS fiscal note and how that is potentially aligned with legislation being contemplated, does that remove the costs associated with it, or does it push it out to the next biennium?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

I can say with certainty it does not incur a fiscal cost within this biennium. The DWSS fiscal note submitted a zero fiscal note. The SSHE indicated the costs would be in a future biennium. There would be a cost associated with it in the future, but they do not believe there would be in this biennium.

STEVE FISHER (Administrator, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, Department of Health and Human Services):

Based on reprint No. 1, which extends the implementation date of from January 2022 to January 2024, we definitely will not have any cost associated with A.B. 432 in the next biennium. This does provide us with an opportunity to

continue to meet with workgroups during the interim period to discuss this particular bill and how it will be implemented. It will also allow the DWSS to reevaluate whether there will be any costs in future biennium.

EMILY PERSAUD-ZAMORA (Executive Director, Silver State Voices):

We are in support of A.B. 432. Funding more methods in which eligible voters may register to vote is imperative to ensure we are welcoming greater participation to our electoral process amongst all Nevadans. We ask that you invest in our democracy through A.B. 432. Our two favorite things about this bill is the expansion of Medicaid and Native American agency's services to increase voter registration rates amongst the Native American population.

MS. LIEBERMANN-PARRAGA:

We support A.B. 432. When a majority of Nevada voters supported the measure to enact an AVR system previously, Nevadans demonstrated they value making our democracy as accessible as possible to every eligible voter. This bill expands that system to include Medicaid, SSHE and other State agencies. We find this to be something worth the investment. The enhancements under A.B. 432 increase the opportunity of eligible Nevadan's to be enfranchised and registered to vote, saving election officials' and voters' time, effort and money while also improving voter security.

ERIC JENG (Asian Community Development Council):

We support A.B. 432. We will echo the previous testimonies. The bill ensures accurate records for existing registrants, opportunities to update mailing addresses and party affiliation. For our community, where one in five Nevadans are foreign-born and half of them are not yet citizens, this bill will have measures to protect them in the AVR system by filtering out DMV customers who provide documents such as green cards or a driver's authorization cards. The proposed measures also add security to protect ineligible residents. This is something we like. Three years ago, we the people passed the AVR system through ballot measure. This bill ensures the peoples' will is respected and expands on the current implementation.

MS. PERSAUD-ZAMORA:

I would add our partners the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada and Chispa Nevada are in support of A.B. 432.

ANWAR GREEN:

I am a veteran of the U.S. Air Force. Having served in our Country's military, I believe we should all have access to our right to vote. As such, I support A.B. 432. The original legislation around AVR was a win for the military and veteran community, and this bill builds on that. Expanding AVR to help human services and other agencies allows for more access to register to vote for military members and their families accessing these services. To me, this is a common sense action that benefits our electoral system as a whole. It continues to ensure that our government remains of the people, for the people and by the people. This is the definition of democracy.

JENNIFER FLEISCHMANN (Co-Director of Organizing, Make the Road Nevada):

We all know that DMV forms can be confusing for anyone, but for a noncitizen, the potential consequences of wrongly being on a voter registration list could keep them from ever being a citizen. In the worst case scenarios, non-citizens could even face deportation. I personally have seen the fear in the faces of our members who have made this mistake, and while it can be fixed, it is a complicated, long and expensive process. We have an opportunity to not only increase voter registration among the eligible but to protect those who are ineligible from this fear.

CECIA ALVARADO (Nevada State Director, Mi Familia Vota):

I support A.B. 432 because the expansion of AVR would work to enfranchise large groups of potential voters in Nevada while also prioritizing Nevada secure measurements. Assembly Bill 432 will maintain the current backend AVR system used by the DMV that protects unregistered Nevadans who are not able to provide proof of U.S. citizenship during their time at the DMV. This backend AVR system will ensure the voter roll reflects State citizenship.

KERRY DURMICK (Nevada Director, All Voting is Local):

We support A.B. 432. Everyone who is eligible should have the freedom to vote. Expanding backend AVR reduces election administration costs by processing more registrations through Medicaid, DHHS, and tribal agencies. Backend AVR replaces thousands of paper voter registration forms that voters would otherwise mail or submit. Processing paper forms is labor-intensive and expensive. It requires data entry and follow-up on missing information or errors. By working with agencies who already collected this data, there will be no need to reenter information from paper forms, saving local election offices time. Similarly, by updating address information more efficiently, backend AVR

reduces undeliverable mail and provisional ballots, saving election officials additional money.

TAYLOR PATTERSON (Bishop Paiute Tribe; Executive Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada):

We support A.B. 432 because it allows for tribal governments to participate in the AVR process while still respecting tribal sovereignty.

TAMMI TIGER (Chair, Board of Directors, Las Vegas Indian Center):

We support A.B. 432 to allow tribal agencies to participate in the State's AVR system. Even with the AVR system in place at the DMV, our community members who already receive tribal identification cards (ID) may not seek a driver's license or State ID and have fewer opportunities to register to vote. Nationally, Medicaid covers around 27 percent of the American Indian and Alaskan Native population. Expanding AVR capabilities to the tribal and health and human services agencies will help to fill gaps in access to voter registration for our people who have one of the lowest rates of voter registration.

ALYSSA CORTES (Executive Director, Silver State Equality):

We support A.B. 432 because it will ensure that eligible Nevadan's who want to participate in our electoral process are automatically registered to vote.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 432 and open the hearing on A.B. 443.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 443 (2nd Reprint)**: Revises the interim committee structure of the Legislature. (BDR 17-1045)

ASSEMBLYMAN STEVE YEAGER (Assembly District No. 9):

This measure revises a way the Nevada Legislature structures its interim activities. The concept of this measure dates back to the 2009-2010 Legislative Interim and was a recommendation at that time from the Interim Committee to Consult with the Director, which unanimously supported what was A.B. No. 578 of 76th Session. In addition, a bill similar to A.B. 443 was presented in 2017 by Senator Nicole Cannizzaro. The bill before you today revisits the matter and is designed to address the serious continuity issues concerning interim committees that still exist today.



In the past, legislative leaders on both sides of the political spectrum expressed a desire to find a better way to organize the interim process and its structure. One of the issues over the years has been the number of legislators appointed to interim committees or studies who have little to no knowledge of the topics being discussed. Another related issue is the number of BDRs submitted by interim committees or studies, and then heard by Session standing committees without members who served on those interim committees. The members who had not served on the committee did not have the benefit of sitting through important testimony and the in-depth review that occurred during the interim.

The new interim committee structure is established under the provisions of A.B. 443. To summarize, the measure applies to certain policy committees meeting during the interim that would be staffed by the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). This proposal however does not touch the Interim Finance Committee, the Economic Forum or the Legislative Commission and the statutory subcommittees associated with those entities.

Section 6 of A.B. 443 is the heart of the proposal. With the exceptions I noted, this section creates several joint interim standing committees that would parallel the jurisdiction of our normal Session standing committees. The names of those committees are on page 6 of A.B. 443, and they will look familiar to you because they are the same committees we have during the normal Legislative Session. In terms of the membership of those committees, each would consist of eight regular members and five alternate members. There would be five Assembly members with three alternates, and three Senate members with two alternates. This section lays out how the members would be appointed.

Section 7 establishes, with regard to quorums and voting, that five members of a joint interim standing committee constitute a quorum. However, much like our interim studies, any recommended legislation must be approved by the majority of the Senate and Assembly members. Other actions can be taken by a majority of those present.

The BDR allocations for the joint interim committees are set forth in section 4 of A.B. 443. Like our current interim statutory committees, each joint interim standing committee is allocated ten BDRs to carry forward to the next Legislative Session. There are important exceptions. The standing Interim Judiciary Committee would receive five additional BDRs dedicated exclusively to juvenile justice topics. The Health and Human Services Interim Committee

would get five additional BDRs dedicated exclusively to child welfare issues. The Interim Committee on Natural Resources will have a Subcommittee of Public Lands underneath Natural Resources. They would have four BDRs exclusively used for the Public Lands Subcommittee.

Section 8 specifics the topics to be reviewed by these committees and indicates they would be established through legislation or as directed by the Legislative Commission. In addition, topics that are within the jurisdiction of the Session standing committees would be assigned to those committees to handle as a whole or through subcommittees during the interim. Section 8 also specifies that the Legislative Commission will review the budget and work programs for each of those committees.

Much of the rest of A.B. 443 are technical changes. There are many references in statute to various standing interim committees we have now. I would note there was one committee in discussions we decided not to abolish. We accomplished this by amendment in the Assembly. This committee is the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults with Special Needs. This Committee is specialized, and it was difficult to find where to place those topics. That would be the only one which would exist outside of what is envisioned in this bill. We did reduce the allocation of the BDR from ten to six because the goal here was not to result in more BDRs than we already have in the interim. The bill in front of you at worst will be neutral in the BDR numbers and in all likelihood will result in fewer BDRs requested during the interim.

In closing, this measure is designed to address the conceptual inefficiency others have experienced during the interim structure. We spend a lot of time and money looking into complex policy issues and broad conceptual matters during the interim. Assembly Bill 443 will streamline the process. One other benefit to the measure is it will help the public understand what the Legislature is doing during the interim. Sometimes the public has a hard time knowing which committees to follow and what they are looking at. If we can mirror the interim committees with what followers of the Nevada Legislature are used to, they will know "I want to follow the Government Affairs Committee in the interim", for example.

There is no fiscal note on A.B. 443, but there was an appropriation added in the Assembly in consultation from Ms. Brenda Erdoes, Director of the LCB, who provided the amount. That number is based on the amount from the interim

funding as existed last interim session. I have conferred with Ms. Erdoes that the floor amendment we added in the Assembly does not change their analysis of the fiscal note. They do not believe they would need any additional appropriation to conduct the work other than what is already in A.B. 443.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I did not see the appropriation in the amended version of A.B. 443. Can you tell me what section it is in, or will it be separate?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

The appropriation is listed in section 51.7.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I served on more interim committees, studies, working groups and taskforces than anyone in the Legislature this last interim. I was also on the Interim Finance Committee. I do not feel like I ever stopped being in Session. The inefficiencies of that system have been frustrating, so I think A.B. 443 makes a ton of sense. I still think we have far too many BDRs in the Legislature. This bill does not address that, but at least there are not more.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

The policy does make a lot of sense and aligning the responsibilities is logical. As it relates to appropriation, it is for "costs to the Legislative Counsel Bureau related to supporting the work of interim studies during the 2021-2022 interim". We did not fund any studies for the upcoming interim. I do not know why we need the appropriations.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

This bill is moving through the Legislature, and we do not know if it will be enacted. If it is not, we would be left with the current structure, which means there will be six interim studies. Those studies have not been figured out. This bill envisions those studies that would normally be passed by the Legislature will be enveloped into the interim standing committees.

The question that was posed to LCB was how much money is needed for those interim studies knowing they are essentially going into A.B. 443. What they did was use the budget of last interim. This amount was their best guess that if this bill were to pass, the additional amounts were needed to bring the interim studies into these new joint interim standing committees.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Now the interim standing committees will have all of their normal responsibilities plus all of the responsibilities of the interim study committees but no additional money for them? In the budget for LCB we approved, we did not appropriate any money to do interim studies. With A.B. 443, they will do all their work plus the work of the interim studies with the same amount of resources?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I do not want to get "beyond my skis" because I do not sit on the Senate Committee on Finance or the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means, also known as the money committees, but my understanding was the interim Legislative budget that exists is to staff the interim committees. The studies are different because you can see them as a supplement to the normal standing committees. The effort here was to recognize that there will be additional costs associated if we bring the studies into the standing committees.

BRENDA ERDOES (Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

To explain what our theory was for the \$35,000, there is a lot of uncertainty with the interim studies this upcoming interim. We thought that we would use the same amount used last time and believe that would cover whatever actions were undertaken.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Should there be interim studies, would this appropriation give LCB the resources to staff them appropriately?

Ms. ERDOES:

Yes, I believe it would.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

Do we have any money in the budget to do the studies themselves?

Ms. ERDOES:

We do not. The theory is we are unsure whether the committees would be conducted entirely through Zoom or some other method.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

On page 8—maybe this is carryover language, and we never applied it—in section 7, subsection 4, of A.B. 443, it talks about compensation for the

legislators. This section states you will be compensated on your daily rate, not only on days you attend meetings but on any day you are working. How does that work?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I am not sure if this is carryover language. The intent was to do what we do now, which is if you attend a meeting, you get your daily rate. Obviously every one of us is working on these issues every day of the interim. I can confirm whether that section was already in statute, but it is certainly not my intent to have us compensated for anything other than attending official meetings of the interim standing committees.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 443 and open the hearing on A.B. 393.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 393 (3rd Reprint)**: Makes various changes relating to criminal justice. (BDR 14-484)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROCHELLE NGUYEN (Assembly District No. 10):

Assembly Bill 393, for lack of a better term, is a cleanup bill. The bill does various cleanup actions to A.B. No. 236 of the 80th Session. We put a lot of responsibility on the Department of Sentencing Policy run by Executive Director Victoria Gonzalez. The appropriation in A.B. 393 is to allow the Executive Director to do the job of collecting the data we are requesting. This data will show the Legislature the millions of dollars in savings that have come from the enactment of A.B. No. 326 of the 80th Session. There are a couple amendments, mostly clarifying, that do not affect the fiscal note.

CHAIR BROOKS:

In section 32.5 of A.B. 393, there is an appropriation in FY 2021-2022 of \$75,345 and in FY 2022-2023 of \$96,987. Is that the entire appropriation?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN:

Yes, that is the entire appropriation.

CHAIR BROOKS:

Can you clarify the Proposed Amendment 3472 (Exhibit F) pertaining to marijuana?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN:

In A.B. No. 236 of the 80th Session, there was evidence-based reform regarding marijuana convictions, drug offenses, and how they were categorized and classified. We did this with other drugs such as methamphetamine, cocaine, heroin and other illicit drugs. Unfortunately, we did not include marijuana. Under statute, marijuana possession was a greater penalty than it was for some of our other more illicit drugs. This amendment is intended to clean up that language.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

Going back to section 32.5 and the appropriation, is that strictly for that department to collect data? Can you tell me more about the data collected?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN:

We created enough work for probably ten positions, and we have one person there. The intent of A.B. No. 236 of the 80th Session was to collect information and data on the savings of those changes we made to the criminal justice system so it could be reinvested back into our communities for things such as pretrial therapy. With A.B. 393, we have given those persons more data to collect to see how much money we are saving. It was estimated we would save tens of millions of dollars over a five-year period. The appropriations in A.B. 393 are there to allow the Department of Sentencing Policy to have the resources to collect, maintain and analyze that data.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

We are spending money to document savings? Is that what I am understanding?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN:

Yes, that is correct to a certain extent. We have made lots of anecdotal decisions on whether or not the criminal justice reform decisions we have made in the past are saving us money and keeping our communities safe. Assembly Bill 393 allows us to make decisions going forward to know whether or not the decisions we are making are evidence-based and have a record of showing we are saving money. It may seem like we are spending money to collect data to analyze how much we are saving—and that is true—but the savings are potentially much more. This will allow us to make more reasoned evidence-based decisions going forward in the future.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will note that A.B. 393 came out of the Assembly unanimously with all members present. It also came out of Committee with unanimous votes. I will close the hearing on A.B. 393, and I will open the work session on A.B. 230.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 230 (2nd Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to juvenile justice. (BDR 5-791)

MR. HAARTZ:

Assembly Bill 230 is the first bill on the work session. This bill was heard on May 29. It was presented by Assemblyman C.H. Miller. The intent of the bill is oriented about juvenile justice and removed certain crimes that would otherwise require the automatic certification or trying of a juvenile as an adult. There was information presented that indicated, notwithstanding that provision, a judge could still certify a juvenile as an adult on a case per case basis.

There is no fiscal impact of A.B. 230 to the DHHS Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) and NDOC based upon fiscal notes submitted. Staff would note the DCFS fiscal note indicated they could not determine whether there would be an impact going forward. The NDOC fiscal note indicated they anticipated a savings in the inmate category as a result of a lower number of juveniles incarcerated in their facilities. Clark County did indicate there was a fiscal note. There are no amendments on the bill.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 230.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 230 and open the work session on A.B. 266.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 266 (2nd Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to class size. (BDR 34-704)

MR. THORLEY:

Assembly Bill 266 was heard by the Committee on May 27. The bill is in its second reprint. Assemblywoman Brittney Miller presented the bill and indicated in her testimony the amendment adopted by the Assembly created a fiscal impact for the NDE. An unsolicited fiscal note was submitted by NDE indicating that additional staff time would need to be allocated toward implementing the provisions of A.B. 266. They are estimating overtime costs for existing positions at \$24,123 in FY 2021-2022 and \$3,583 in FY 2022-2023. Deputy Superintendent Felicia Gonzales with the NDE confirmed the Department's fiscal note is still valid in the second reprint of A.B. 266.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
A.B. 266.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS GOICOECHEA, HAMMOND,  
KIECKHEFER AND SEEVERS GANSERT VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 266 and open the work session on A.B. 349.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 349 (2nd Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing motor vehicles. (BDR 43-58)

MR. HAARTZ:

Assembly Bill 349 was heard on May 27. Assemblyman Howard Watts presented the bill. There was a conceptual amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) dated May 27, 2021. [Exhibit G](#) proposes to strike the proposed changes in section 9, subsection 4. It indicates to strike the language in section 6 and amend the new language in section 7 to read the regulations adopted pursuant to this section shall not provide for a fee in excess of \$2 for an inspector to be licensed at additional locations of a test station. The final part of [Exhibit G](#) was to strike section 8 of the bill.



There was discussion with regard to the intent of the conceptual amendment and whether that removed the DMVs fiscal note. The information provided was somewhat confusing by the DMV. Staff went over information that the DMV subsequently provided for clarification. Subsequent to the hearing, staff worked with the DMV to receive an updated fiscal note and better understand the impact to the DMV. At this time it appears there would be a fiscal impact of \$164,144 in FY 2021-2022 and \$51,734 in FY 2022-2023. Both those impacts are Highway Fund impacts primarily related to the reduction in fee revenue that would be collected as a result of actions within the bill to extend the timeframe for a new vehicle before required to receive a smog test. There would also be an impact as a result of the change in fee revenue associated with an inspector working at multiple locations versus being required to pay a fee for each location.

MR. THORLEY:

There is also a proposed amendment ([Exhibit H](#)) to A.B. 349 from Clark County that the bill sponsor forwarded to Fiscal staff. The County indicated it did not have a way on its own to collect fees from the emission stations as the DMV is collecting those fees. An amendment was recommended that would allow the Board of County Commissioners by ordinance impose an additional fee for certifying emission control compliance. Upon notification from the County, the DMV would collect that additional fee in the same manner it collects other fees.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
A.B. 349 WITH BOTH CONCEPTUAL AMENDMENTS.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I will support A.B. 349 out of this Committee, but I reserve my right to change my vote on the Senate Floor. I like some of the policy, but some of this bill I do not like.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS HAMMOND, KIECKHEFER AND  
SEEVERS GANSERT VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 30, 2021  
Page 34

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 349 and open the work session on A.B. 376.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 376 (2nd Reprint)**: Enacts the Keep Nevada Working Act and makes various other changes relating to immigration. (BDR 18-737)

MR. THORLEY:

Assembly Bill 376 in its second reprint was presented on May 29 by Assemblywoman Selena Torres. The bill would enact the Keep Nevada Working Act. In section 26.5 of the bill is an appropriation of \$500,000 to the immigration clinic at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, School of Law for the purpose of providing pro bono legal services relating to immigration law. In its original submission, A.B. 376 would have imposed some duties on the Office of New Americans, however a subsequent adopted amendment transferred those duties related to the Keep Nevada Working Taskforce to the Lieutenant Governor's Office.

Assemblywoman Torres did indicate the Lieutenant Governor's Office did not submit a fiscal note related to any impact the administrative duties of the Keep Nevada Working Taskforce would have. There is language in the bill and testimony was provided the Lieutenant Governor's Office would seek gifts, grants and donations. Assemblywoman Torres also pointed out the duties of the Taskforce in section 20 include the word "may", which is permissive language. There were no amendments discussed.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 376.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS GOICOECHEA, HAMMOND, KIECKHEFER AND SEEVERS GANSERT VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 376 and open the work session on A.B. 387.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 387 (2nd Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to midwives.  
(BDR 54-225)

MR. THORLEY:

Assembly Bill 387 was presented by Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno on May 29. While she was summarizing the provisions in the bill, she also discussed the fiscal notes submitted as introduced. There was also a conceptual amendment (Exhibit I) discussed. Staffs understanding of Exhibit I is it was brought forward to resolve a conflict between A.B. 287.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 287 (3rd Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to childbirth.  
(BDR 40-799)

It would establish one consistent definition of the term midwife for the purposes of NRS 440 and NRS 442.

SENATOR DENIS:

I continue to have issues with the policy, but I do think A.B. 387 should move forward. I will vote yes, but I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
A.B. 387.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I will support A.B. 387. Midwives are an option, but if you have a hospital available, go to the best choice.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR HAMMOND VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 387 and open the work session on A.B. 445.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 445 (2nd Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to financial administration. (BDR 18-862)

MR. HAARTZ:

Assembly Bill 445 was presented by Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno on May 29. The bill performs several actions, including transferring the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management from the Department of Administration to the Office of the Governor and renaming it as the Office of Federal Assistance. Additionally, A.B. 445 creates a Nevada grant matching program to provide funds to certain public agencies, tribal governments and nonprofit organizations as a source of matching funds for federal grants. It requires that certain monies be transferred from the Abandoned Property Trust Account as a source of funds for the Nevada matching grant program.

The bill makes appropriations. On page 19 of A.B. 445, in section 29.6, it proposes to make a General Fund appropriation to the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management in the sum of \$279,979 in FY 2021-2022 for personnel, operating costs and costs of upgrades to the grant management system. Additionally, in section 29.63 there is an appropriation of State General Funds to the newly created Office of Federal Assistance in the sum of \$1,091,010 in FY 2022-2023 for personnel, operating costs and costs of upgrades to the grant management system related to carrying out this Act.

In section 29.7 of A.B. 445, there is an appropriation from the State General Fund to the Office of the State Controller for personnel costs related to additional reporting of federal funding that would result from the grant matching program. Those appropriations are \$89,537 in FY 2021-2022 and \$115,772 in FY 2022-2023. Finally, in section 29.7 there is language that requires as soon as practicable at the close of the FY 2020-2021 the State Controller shall transfer \$1 million from the balance of the Abandoned Property Trust Account to the grant matching account for the purposes of granting out those funds as match for federal grants.

Senator Kieckhefer had asked a question regarding the balance of the Abandoned Property Trust Account. Staffs' understanding is it is approximately \$42 million. Staff would note that after the first \$7.6 million of that balance each year is transferred to the Millennium Scholarship Trust Fund, this \$1 million transfer would occur. The balance of that is then transferred as an unrestricted revenue source to the General Fund. There are no new amendments or conceptual amendments presented.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

The Treasurer also followed up with me to talk about the status of that account. His detailed analysis was it was flush with cash. This sounds accurate as to the feedback we received from Mr. Haartz as well.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED DO PASS A.B. 445.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 445 and open the work session on S.B. 463.

MR. THORLEY:

Senate Bill 463 was presented by me earlier today. The bill includes a \$3.8 million General Fund appropriation to the NDE. This amount will be allocated to 12 charter schools identified in S.B. 463 in FY 2021-2022 and 9 charter schools in FY 2022-2023 as onetime funding as a result of those charter schools receiving less funding under the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan than the calculated FY 2020-2021 hold harmless amount. There were no amendments to the bill.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 463.

SENATOR HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on S.B. 463 and open the work session on A.B. 416.

MR. HAARTZ:

Assembly Bill 416 was presented today by Mr. Warren Hardy representing the Council for a Better Nevada. This bill calls for the annual audit of certain aspects of NSHE. Assembly Bill 416 makes an appropriation to the Legislative Fund for use by the Audit Division of the LCB for overtime and travel costs related to conducting the audit. The appropriation is in the amount of \$80,250 in FY 2021-2022 and \$128,750 in FY 2022-2023. There are no amendments. This bill becomes effective July 1, 2021.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

Under section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a), A.B. 416 talks about auditing "the sources and uses of money privately donated to each school within the System and the System, including, without limitation, adherence to the terms and agreements of the donations... ." I think some of that information is confidential. I support the bill but I am not 100 percent sure all of that is readily available public information.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

We did have a problem with that. There was an issue with a donation to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, regarding the medical school and the confidentiality. It is a solid point made by my colleague.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 416.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 416 and open the work session on A.B. 432.

MR. THORLEY:

Assembly Bill 432 in its second reprint was presented today by Assemblyman Howard Watts. The bill expands AVR requirements to certain Executive Branch agencies. Assemblyman Watts discussed the fiscal notes from the DWSS and the SSHE. He indicated that with a change in the effective date

of the legislation, those two agencies no longer have a fiscal impact associated with A.B. 432 in the 2021-2023 biennium. Administrator Steve Fisher with the DWSS confirmed that understanding.

There are two appropriations in A.B. 432. One is to the DMV on page 36, section 32.7, which is a General Fund appropriation to the Division of Field Services within the DMV in the amount \$48,233 for computer programming costs relating to the AVR. I note this appropriation is from the General Fund and not the Highway Fund because the voter registration duties of the DMV is not an authorized expense under the Highway Fund statutes. Under section 32.3, there is a General Fund appropriation of \$736,391 in FY 2021-2022 and \$346,439 in FY 2022-2023 to the Secretary of State for personnel costs to develop processes and systems for AVR with the various Executive Branch agencies as defined in section 2.

No amendments were presented for A.B. 432.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 432.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS GOICHOECHEA, HAMMOND, KIECKHEFER AND SEEVERS GANSERT VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 432 and open the work session on A.B. 224.

MR. THORLEY:

Assembly Bill 224 in its second reprint was presented today by Assemblywoman Bea Duran. The bill requires school districts and charter schools to provide menstrual products at no cost in student bathrooms. Lindsay Anderson from the WCSD spoke about the District's revised fiscal note. The WCSD's fiscal note indicated a cost of \$27,240 in FY 2021-2022 and \$20,040 in FY 2022-2023. Brad Keating with the CCSD also spoke about CCSD's fiscal note. The CCSD says the fiscal impact will be \$157,000 in FY 2021-2022 and \$132,000 in FY 2022-2023.

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 30, 2021  
Page 40

Section 3.7 of A.B. 224 creates an interim study concerning access to menstrual products in middle school, junior high schools and high schools in the State. There is no funding in the bill related to that study. If the Committee wishes, they can amend that portion out of A.B. 224.

SENATOR RATTI:

I would recommend we amend A.B. 224 by removing section 3.7.

CHAIR BROOKS:

I agree; we do not have any studies funded and have been trying to hold that line this Session. Otherwise, funding the actual work in the program I think is incredibly important.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED BY REMOVING SECTION 3.7 FROM A.B. 224.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 224 and open the work session on A.B. 241.

MR. HAARTZ:

Assembly Bill 241 was presented by Assemblywoman Cecilia Gonzalez and heard today. What was presented was [Exhibit C](#). The Parole Board discussed how this amendment restored the retroactivity that had previously been amended out of the bill from the introduced version.

The fiscal note that had been submitted originally by the Parole Board, which is now in affect again, totaled \$13,956 in FY 2021-2022. There was no cost identified for the second year of the biennium or in future biennium. The Board indicated that the fiscal note represented an increase to the hearing representative costs they anticipate having to fund.



SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 241 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 3471.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 241 and open the work session on A.B. 256.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 256 (1st Reprint)**: Provides for Medicaid coverage of doula services. (BDR 38-849)

MR. THORLEY:

Assembly Bill 256 was heard by the Committee on May 28 and presented by Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong. The bill requires a doula who desires to receive reimbursement through the Medicaid program through the provision of doula services to a Medicaid recipient to enroll with the Division of Healthcare, Financing and Policy. The bill also requires an enrolled doula to report suspected abuse and neglect in certain cases. Lastly, DHHS must apply for a waiver of the federal Medicaid requirements or request to amend the State Plan to receive federal funding to provide coverage of doula services.

The Division of Healthcare, Financing, and Policy anticipates that A.B. 256 would have a savings on the medical side of the budget. On the administration side, they did indicate there would be a cost. However, in the back language of the Appropriations Act, there is a transfer of funding authorized from the medical budget to the Medicaid administration budget to cover the cost of any technology upgrades needed. There were no amendments.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 256.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 256 and open the work session on A.B. 321.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 321 (2nd Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to elections.  
(BDR 24-927)

MR. HAARTZ:

Assembly Bill 321 was presented by Assemblyman Jason Frierson on May 29. The bill focuses on voting by mail. From a fiscal impact standpoint, section 89.5 contains a General Fund appropriation to the Secretary of State's Office in the amount of \$6,286,844 in FY 2021-2022 and \$5,998,138 in FY 2022-2023 to fund the cost of ballot stock, postage and postcard notifications to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 321.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS GOICOECHEA, HAMMOND, KIECKHEFER AND SEEVERS GANSERT VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 321 and open the work session on A.B. 355.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 355 (1st Reprint)**: Makes appropriations for various purposes relating to health and education. (BDR S-976)

MR. THORLEY:

Assembly Bill 355 was heard May 29. The bill contains various appropriations to nonprofit organizations. Jan Jones Blackhurst presented the bill. Proposed Amendment 3480 (Exhibit J) does two things. First, it adds section 8 which

appropriates \$1 million from the General Fund to Immunize Nevada for activities related to public health. Second, the amendment makes changes to the appropriation date to the various other General Fund appropriations included in the bill to make it so all appropriations are FY 2020-2021 General Fund appropriations. The total dollar amount did not change. The total dollar amount of the appropriations in A.B. 355 is \$8.2 million.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

Can the funding for Immunize Nevada be available through the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 funds, and we switch out the funding source later?

SENATOR RATTI:

Immunize Nevada is a small but mighty Statewide organization that works on immunizations across the State. It has been a significant partner to the State. When the time came for the immunization push during the Covid-19 pandemic, they stepped up and became a part of the team that was helping to address the pandemic. After speaking to the Executive Director of Immunize Nevada, my understanding is they will be receiving more federal funding specifically relating to Covid-19 immunizations and ensuring a good job in disparate impact. Those funding streams are narrowly tailored to Covid-19 immunizations and disparate impact for communities of color.

School season is coming up, and the base work that Immunize Nevada has always done—which is making sure children have immunizations before going back to school—is in jeopardy because they have all of this other work coming through. The intent of Amendment 3480 is to give Immunize Nevada flexible funding that does not come with as many strings, so they can continue to do their base work and be strategic about stepping up to use the federal funding that will be coming in.

SENATOR RATTI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
A.B. 355 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 3480.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I will vote yes to move A.B. 355 out of the Committee but reserve my right to change my vote on the floor when we land on where we are financially.

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 30, 2021  
Page 44

SENATOR HAMMOND:  
I echo Senator Kieckhefer's comments.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:  
I share the same comments.

CHAIR BROOKS:  
I have the same reservations, but this is part of the process.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:  
I will close the work session on A.B. 355 and open the work session on A.B. 393.

MR. HAARTZ:  
Assembly Bill 393 was heard today. Proposed Amendment 3472, [Exhibit F](#) amends section 8 of A.B. 393 in subsection 5 to require if the Division of Parole and Probation Department of Public Safety, staff make a:

...finding that a term or condition of probation ordered pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 176A.400 or the level of supervision set pursuant to this section does not align with the result of a risk and needs assessment administered pursuant to subsection 1 or 2, the supervising officer shall notify the court of such a finding; and the court may modify the terms and conditions pursuant to NRS 176A.450.

This bill also contains a General Fund appropriation. Section 32.5 includes a General Fund appropriation to the Department of Sentencing Policy of \$75,345 in FY 2021-2022 for personnel costs related to data management. In FY 2022-2023, there is an appropriation of \$96,987.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 393 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 3472.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 393 and open the work session on A.B. 443.

MR. THORLEY:

Assembly Bill 443 was presented today by Assemblyman Steve Yeager. The bill revises the interim committee structure of the Nevada Legislature. This bill would generally align interim committees with the regular joint standing committees. The bill does not make any changes to the Interim Finance Committee, the Economic Forum or the Legislative Commission. The measure also makes changes to the number of BDRs allowed to be requested by the various interim committees. Assemblyman Yeager also noted that the Legislative Committee on Senior Citizens, Veterans and Adults with Special Needs would remain as is and not be absorbed.

There is a General Fund appropriation in section 51.7 of A.B. 443. This would appropriate \$35,000 for interim studies during the upcoming interim. There were no amendments proposed to the bill.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 443.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 443 and open the work session on A.B. 489.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 489**: Makes appropriations to the Legislative Fund for capital improvement projects, one-time building maintenance, information technology purchases and dues for national and regional organizations. (BDR S-1066)

MR. HAARTZ:

Assembly Bill 489 was presented today by LCB Director Brenda Erdoes. This bill makes an appropriation to the Legislative Fund for capital improvement projects, one-time building maintenance, information technology purchases and dues for national and regional organizations. Section 1 appropriates General Fund dollars to the Legislative Fund in the amount of \$11,403,000 for capital improvement projects. Section 2 appropriates from the General Fund to the Legislative Fund:

The sum of \$4,583,500 for computer hardware, voting system modernization, facility security system upgrade, broadcast infrastructure upgrade, one-time building maintenance and the payment of dues to national and regional organizations.

This bill become effective upon passage and approval.

CHAIR BROOKS:

This is far more than is generally requested for the Legislative capital improvement projects and maintenance, but we have been operating on a lean budget at the LCB for a long time. There are repairs that need to be made and the changing climate has led to facility improvements from a security standpoint. In addition, accommodating the public with more access electronically to participate in these meetings during the pandemic has led to increased cost. This has shown us we can increase the way the public can participate when they cannot come to Carson City. This is a modernization effort. I will support A.B. 489.

SENATOR DENIS MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 489.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR BROOKS:

I will close the work session on A.B. 489 and move to public comment.

Senate Committee on Finance  
May 30, 2021  
Page 47

CHAIR BROOKS:

Seeing no public comment, the meeting is adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Ian Gahner,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Chris Brooks, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit Letter</b>	<b>Begins on Page</b>	<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
S.B. 463	B	1	Chris Daly / Nevada State Education Association	Opposition Testimony
A.B. 241	C	1	Assemblywoman Cecilia Gonzalez	Proposed Amendment 3471
A.B. 241	D	1	Alex Haartz	Parole Board Memorandum
A.B. 241	E	1	Alex Haartz	NDOC Memorandum
A.B. 393	F	1	Alex Haartz	Proposed Amendment 3472
A.B. 349	G	1	Alex Haartz	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 349	H	1	Wayne Thorley	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 387	I	1	Wayne Thorley	Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 355	J	1	Wayne Thorley	Proposed Amendment 3480